

BX
6495
.C87A2

SIT

LIGHT IN A D

BY G. A. C

A full explanation of "No Prom
"No Discipleship without B
teachings of the author on
Baptism," with a short b
life, and a full explan
that occurred between
Association of Bap
during the year
'71, and ho

FIVE OF THE AU

ON IMPORTA

*"Obedience manifests Faith;"
"we become Christians;" "Th
baptised," a reply to Robert
of Baptism to Salvation;
ley; also much inte
before ma*

THE AUTHOR'S PI

PRICE, FIFTY

Address **G. A. COULSON**, Car
Or **SHERILL**

LOUISVI

WEBB & BREEDING, BO

18

T L U X,

—OR—

A DARK CORNER

G. A. COULSON.

"No Promise to the Unbaptised as such," without Baptism;" a synopsis of the author on the subject of "Christianity," with a short biographical sketch of his life, and a full explanation of the difficulty which existed between him and the Salem Convention of Baptists in Kentucky during the years 1868, '69, '70, '71, and how it ended;

THE AUTHOR'S SERMONS

ON IMPORTANT SUBJECTS:

"Faith;" "The Transformation;" "How to be Saved;" "There are Promises to the Unbaptised;" "A Reply to Robert Thurman;" "The Relation of Baptism to Salvation;" a reply to R. M. Dudley. Much interesting matter never before made known.

AUTHOR'S PRESENT POSITION.

FIFTY CENTS A COPY.

G. A. COULSON, Campbellsville, Ky.

HERRILL, SON & CO., Louisville, Ky.

LOUISVILLE, KY.:

REEDING, BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS.

1873.

The University of Chicago
Libraries



DURRETT COLLECTION



SIT LUX,

—OR—

LIGHT IN A DARK CORNER.

BY G. A. COULSON.

A full explanation of "No Promise to the Unbaptised as such," "No Discipleship without Baptism;" a synopsis of the teachings of the author on the subject of "Christian Baptism," with a short biographical sketch of his life, and a full explanation of the difficulty that occurred between him and the Salem Association of Baptists in Kentucky during the years 1868, '69, '70, '71, and how it ended;

FIVE OF THE AUTHOR'S SERMONS

ON IMPORTANT SUBJECTS:

"Obedience manifests Faith;" "The Transformation;" "How we become Christians;" "There are Promises to the Unbaptised," a reply to Robert Thurman; "The Relation of Baptism to Salvation," a reply to R. M. Dudley; also much interesting matter never before made known.

THE AUTHOR'S PRESENT POSITION.

LOUISVILLE, KY.:

WEBB & BREEDING, BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS.

1873.

26/1
C/855

TO
FROM
ALL
COUNTRIES

BX6495
C87 A2

473535

PREFACE.

THE indulgence of the "*literary critic*" is asked in behalf of this little work. It has been written at short intervals, snatched from the arduous duties of the pulpit or the school-room. There are many repetitions of the same idea, if not in the same words; especially is this so in the five sermons. But this will be easily explained, when it is remembered that these were preached at different times, and in different places. Some of the ideas may not be fully brought out in one, while they will be in another. We hope the reader will not take isolated sentences for our meaning, but the tenor of the entire work. Some things personal in the two sermons, *as replies*, would have been left out, but from the fact that I was fearful some would say I left out the objectional parts. I mean no offence. I love Brother Thurman and Brother Dudley, as the ministers of Christ. I hope they never intended to do me wrong in anything they did. I know I have none but kind feelings for them now. Bro. Thurman has my special thanks for his kindness shown since the difficulty ended. I thought it best simply to give the sermons to the public as they were delivered.

D 5187

G. A. C.

12-13-14
15-16-17
18-19-20
21-22-23
24-25-26
27-28-29
30-31-32
33-34-35
36-37-38
39-40-41
42-43-44
45-46-47
48-49-50
51-52-53
54-55-56
57-58-59
60-61-62
63-64-65
66-67-68
69-70-71
72-73-74
75-76-77
78-79-80
81-82-83
84-85-86
87-88-89
90-91-92
93-94-95
96-97-98
99-100-101
102-103-104
105-106-107
108-109-110
111-112-113
114-115-116
117-118-119
120-121-122
123-124-125
126-127-128
129-130-131
132-133-134
135-136-137
138-139-140
141-142-143
144-145-146
147-148-149
150-151-152
153-154-155
156-157-158
159-160-161
162-163-164
165-166-167
168-169-170
171-172-173
174-175-176
177-178-179
180-181-182
183-184-185
186-187-188
189-190-191
192-193-194
195-196-197
198-199-200
201-202-203
204-205-206
207-208-209
210-211-212
213-214-215
216-217-218
219-220-221
222-223-224
225-226-227
228-229-230
231-232-233
234-235-236
237-238-239
240-241-242
243-244-245
246-247-248
249-250-251
252-253-254
255-256-257
258-259-260
261-262-263
264-265-266
267-268-269
270-271-272
273-274-275
276-277-278
279-280-281
282-283-284
285-286-287
288-289-290
291-292-293
294-295-296
297-298-299
300-301-302
303-304-305
306-307-308
309-310-311
312-313-314
315-316-317
318-319-320
321-322-323
324-325-326
327-328-329
330-331-332
333-334-335
336-337-338
339-340-341
342-343-344
345-346-347
348-349-350
351-352-353
354-355-356
357-358-359
360-361-362
363-364-365
366-367-368
369-370-371
372-373-374
375-376-377
378-379-380
381-382-383
384-385-386
387-388-389
390-391-392
393-394-395
396-397-398
399-400-401
402-403-404
405-406-407
408-409-410
411-412-413
414-415-416
417-418-419
420-421-422
423-424-425
426-427-428
429-430-431
432-433-434
435-436-437
438-439-440
441-442-443
444-445-446
447-448-449
450-451-452
453-454-455
456-457-458
459-460-461
462-463-464
465-466-467
468-469-470
471-472-473
474-475-476
477-478-479
480-481-482
483-484-485
486-487-488
489-490-491
492-493-494
495-496-497
498-499-500
501-502-503
504-505-506
507-508-509
510-511-512
513-514-515
516-517-518
519-520-521
522-523-524
525-526-527
528-529-530
531-532-533
534-535-536
537-538-539
540-541-542
543-544-545
546-547-548
549-550-551
552-553-554
555-556-557
558-559-560
561-562-563
564-565-566
567-568-569
570-571-572
573-574-575
576-577-578
579-580-581
582-583-584
585-586-587
588-589-590
591-592-593
594-595-596
597-598-599
600-601-602
603-604-605
606-607-608
609-610-611
612-613-614
615-616-617
618-619-620
621-622-623
624-625-626
627-628-629
630-631-632
633-634-635
636-637-638
639-640-641
642-643-644
645-646-647
648-649-650
651-652-653
654-655-656
657-658-659
660-661-662
663-664-665
666-667-668
669-670-671
672-673-674
675-676-677
678-679-680
681-682-683
684-685-686
687-688-689
690-691-692
693-694-695
696-697-698
699-700-701
702-703-704
705-706-707
708-709-710
711-712-713
714-715-716
717-718-719
720-721-722
723-724-725
726-727-728
729-730-731
732-733-734
735-736-737
738-739-740
741-742-743
744-745-746
747-748-749
750-751-752
753-754-755
756-757-758
759-760-761
762-763-764
765-766-767
768-769-770
771-772-773
774-775-776
777-778-779
780-781-782
783-784-785
786-787-788
789-790-791
792-793-794
795-796-797
798-799-800
801-802-803
804-805-806
807-808-809
810-811-812
813-814-815
816-817-818
819-820-821
822-823-824
825-826-827
828-829-830
831-832-833
834-835-836
837-838-839
840-841-842
843-844-845
846-847-848
849-850-851
852-853-854
855-856-857
858-859-860
861-862-863
864-865-866
867-868-869
870-871-872
873-874-875
876-877-878
879-880-881
882-883-884
885-886-887
888-889-890
891-892-893
894-895-896
897-898-899
900-901-902
903-904-905
906-907-908
909-910-911
912-913-914
915-916-917
918-919-920
921-922-923
924-925-926
927-928-929
930-931-932
933-934-935
936-937-938
939-940-941
942-943-944
945-946-947
948-949-950
951-952-953
954-955-956
957-958-959
960-961-962
963-964-965
966-967-968
969-970-971
972-973-974
975-976-977
978-979-980
981-982-983
984-985-986
987-988-989
990-991-992
993-994-995
996-997-998
999-1000-1001
1002-1003-1004
1005-1006-1007
1008-1009-1010
1011-1012-1013
1014-1015-1016
1017-1018-1019
1020-1021-1022
1023-1024-1025
1026-1027-1028
1029-1030-1031
1032-1033-1034
1035-1036-1037
1038-1039-1040
1041-1042-1043
1044-1045-1046
1047-1048-1049
1050-1051-1052
1053-1054-1055
1056-1057-1058
1059-1060-1061
1062-1063-1064
1065-1066-1067
1068-1069-1070
1071-1072-1073
1074-1075-1076
1077-1078-1079
1080-1081-1082
1083-1084-1085
1086-1087-1088
1089-1090-1091
1092-1093-1094
1095-1096-1097
1098-1099-1100
1101-1102-1103
1104-1105-1106
1107-1108-1109
1110-1111-1112
1113-1114-1115
1116-1117-1118
1119-1120-1121
1122-1123-1124
1125-1126-1127
1128-1129-1130
1131-1132-1133
1134-1135-1136
1137-1138-1139
1140-1141-1142
1143-1144-1145
1146-1147-1148
1149-1150-1151
1152-1153-1154
1155-1156-1157
1158-1159-1160
1161-1162-1163
1164-1165-1166
1167-1168-1169
1170-1171-1172
1173-1174-1175
1176-1177-1178
1179-1180-1181
1182-1183-1184
1185-1186-1187
1188-1189-1190
1191-1192-1193
1194-1195-1196
1197-1198-1199
1200-1201-1202
1203-1204-1205
1206-1207-1208
1209-1210-1211
1212-1213-1214
1215-1216-1217
1218-1219-1220
1221-1222-1223
1224-1225-1226
1227-1228-1229
1230-1231-1232
1233-1234-1235
1236-1237-1238
1239-1240-1241
1242-1243-1244
1245-1246-1247
1248-1249-1250
1251-1252-1253
1254-1255-1256
1257-1258-1259
1260-1261-1262
1263-1264-1265
1266-1267-1268
1269-1270-1271
1272-1273-1274
1275-1276-1277
1278-1279-1280
1281-1282-1283
1284-1285-1286
1287-1288-1289
1290-1291-1292
1293-1294-1295
1296-1297-1298
1299-1300-1301
1302-1303-1304
1305-1306-1307
1308-1309-1310
1311-1312-1313
1314-1315-1316
1317-1318-1319
1320-1321-1322
1323-1324-1325
1326-1327-1328
1329-1330-1331
1332-1333-1334
1335-1336-1337
1338-1339-1340
1341-1342-1343
1344-1345-1346
1347-1348-1349
1350-1351-1352
1353-1354-1355
1356-1357-1358
1359-1360-1361
1362-1363-1364
1365-1366-1367
1368-1369-1370
1371-1372-1373
1374-1375-1376
1377-1378-1379
1380-1381-1382
1383-1384-1385
1386-1387-1388
1389-1390-1391
1392-1393-1394
1395-1396-1397
1398-1399-1400
1401-1402-1403
1404-1405-1406
1407-1408-1409
1410-1411-1412
1413-1414-1415
1416-1417-1418
1419-1420-1421
1422-1423-1424
1425-1426-1427
1428-1429-1430
1431-1432-1433
1434-1435-1436
1437-1438-1439
1440-1441-1442
1443-1444-1445
1446-1447-1448
1449-1450-1451
1452-1453-1454
1455-1456-1457
1458-1459-1460
1461-1462-1463
1464-1465-1466
1467-1468-1469
1470-1471-1472
1473-1474-1475
1476-1477-1478
1479-1480-1481
1482-1483-1484
1485-1486-1487
1488-1489-1490
1491-1492-1493
1494-1495-1496
1497-1498-1499
1500-1501-1502
1503-1504-1505
1506-1507-1508
1509-1510-1511
1512-1513-1514
1515-1516-1517
1518-1519-1520
1521-1522-1523
1524-1525-1526
1527-1528-1529
1530-1531-1532
1533-1534-1535
1536-1537-1538
1539-1540-1541
1542-1543-1544
1545-1546-1547
1548-1549-1550
1551-1552-1553
1554-1555-1556
1557-1558-1559
1560-1561-1562
1563-1564-1565
1566-1567-1568
1569-1570-1571
1572-1573-1574
1575-1576-1577
1578-1579-1580
1581-1582-1583
1584-1585-1586
1587-1588-1589
1590-1591-1592
1593-1594-1595
1596-1597-1598
1599-1600-1601
1602-1603-1604
1605-1606-1607
1608-1609-1610
1611-1612-1613
1614-1615-1616
1617-1618-1619
1620-1621-1622
1623-1624-1625
1626-1627-1628
1629-1630-1631
1632-1633-1634
1635-1636-1637
1638-1639-1640
1641-1642-1643
1644-1645-1646
1647-1648-1649
1650-1651-1652
1653-1654-1655
1656-1657-1658
1659-1660-1661
1662-1663-1664
1665-1666-1667
1668-1669-1670
1671-1672-1673
1674-1675-1676
1677-1678-1679
1680-1681-1682
1683-1684-1685
1686-1687-1688
1689-1690-1691
1692-1693-1694
1695-1696-1697
1698-1699-1700
1701-1702-1703
1704-1705-1706
1707-1708-1709
1710-1711-1712
1713-1714-1715
1716-1717-1718
1719-1720-1721
1722-1723-1724
1725-1726-1727
1728-1729-1730
1731-1732-1733
1734-1735-1736
1737-1738-1739
1740-1741-1742
1743-1744-1745
1746-1747-1748
1749-1750-1751
1752-1753-1754
1755-1756-1757
1758-1759-1760
1761-1762-1763
1764-1765-1766
1767-1768-1769
1770-1771-1772
1773-1774-1775
1776-1777-1778
1779-1780-1781
1782-1783-1784
1785-1786-1787
1788-1789-1790
1791-1792-1793
1794-1795-1796
1797-1798-1799
1800-1801-1802
1803-1804-1805
1806-1807-1808
1809-1810-1811
1812-1813-1814
1815-1816-1817
1818-1819-1820
1821-1822-1823
1824-1825-1826
1827-1828-1829
1830-1831-1832
1833-1834-1835
1836-1837-1838
1839-1840-1841
1842-1843-1844
1845-1846-1847
1848-1849-1850
1851-1852-1853
1854-1855-1856
1857-1858-1859
1860-1861-1862
1863-1864-1865
1866-1867-1868
1869-1870-1871
1872-1873-1874
1875-1876-1877
1878-1879-1880
1881-1882-1883
1884-1885-1886
1887-1888-1889
1890-1891-1892
1893-1894-1895
1896-1897-1898
1899-1900-1901
1902-1903-1904
1905-1906-1907
1908-1909-1910
1911-1912-1913
1914-1915-1916
1917-1918-1919
1920-1921-1922
1923-1924-1925
1926-1927-1928
1929-1930-1931
1932-1933-1934
1935-1936-1937
1938-1939-1940
1941-1942-1943
1944-1945-1946
1947-1948-1949
1950-1951-1952
1953-1954-1955
1956-1957-1958
1959-1960-1961
1962-1963-1964
1965-1966-1967
1968-1969-1970
1971-1972-1973
1974-1975-1976
1977-1978-1979
1980-1981-1982
1983-1984-1985
1986-1987-1988
1989-1990-1991
1992-1993-1994
1995-1996-1997
1998-1999-2000
2001-2002-2003
2004-2005-2006
2007-2008-2009
2010-2011-2012
2013-2014-2015
2016-2017-2018
2019-2020-2021
2022-2023-2024
2025-2026-2027
2028-2029-2030
2031-2032-2033
2034-2035-2036
2037-2038-2039
2040-2041-2042
2043-2044-2045
2046-2047-2048
2049-2050-2051
2052-2053-2054
2055-2056-2057
2058-2059-2060
2061-2062-2063
2064-2065-2066
2067-2068-2069
2070-2071-2072
2073-2074-2075
2076-2077-2078
2079-2080-2081
2082-2083-2084
2085-2086-2087
2088-2089-2090
2091-2092-2093
2094-2095-2096
2097-2098-2099
2100-2101-2102
2103-2104-2105
2106-2107-2108
2109-2110-2111
2112-2113-2114
2115-2116-2117
2118-2119-2120
2121-2122-2123
2124-2125-2126
2127-2128-2129
2130-2131-2132
2133-2134-2135
2136-2137-2138
2139-2140-2141
2142-2143-2144
2145-2146-2147
2148-2149-2150
2151-2152-2153
2154-2155-2156
2157-2158-2159
2160-2161-2162
2163-2164-2165
2166-2167-2168
2169-2170-2171
2172-2173-2174
2175-2176-2177
2178-2179-2180
2181-2182-2183
2184-2185-2186
2187-2188-2189
2190-2191-2192
2193-2194-2195
2196-2197-2198
2199-2200-2201
2202-2203-2204
2205-2206-2207
2208-2209-2210
2211-2212-2213
2214-2215-2216
2217-2218-2219
2220-2221-2222
2223-2224-2225
2226-2227-2228
2229-2230-2231
2232-2233-2234
2235-2236-2237
2238-2239-2240
2241-2242-2243
2244-2245-2246
2247-2248-2249
2250-2251-2252
2253-2254-2255
2256-2257-2258
2259-2260-2261
2262-2263-2264
2265-2266-2267
2268-2269-2270
2271-2272-2273
2274-2275-2276
2277-2278-2279
2280-2281-2282
2283-2284-2285
2286-2287-2288
2289-2290-2291
2292-2293-2294
2295-2296-2297
2298-2299-2300
2301-2302-2303
2304-2305-2306
2307-2308-2309
2310-2311-2312
2313-2314-2315
2316-2317-2318
2319-2320-2321
2322-2323-2324
2325-2326-2327
2328-2329-2330
2331-2332-2333
2334-2335-2336
2337-2338-2339
2340-2341-2342
2343-2344-2345
2346-2347-2348
2349-2350-2351
2352-2353-2354
2355-2356-2357
2358-2359-2360
2361-2362-2363
2364-2365-2366
2367-2368-2369
2370-2371-2372
2373-2374-2375
2376-2377-2378
2379-2380-2381
2382-2383-2384
2385-2386-2387
2388-2389-2390
2391-2392-2393
2394-2395-2396
2397-2398-2399
2400-2401-2402
2403-2404-2405
2406-2407-2408
2409-2410-2411
2412-2413-2414
2415-2416-2417
2418-2419-2420
2421-2422-2423
2424-2425-2426
2427-2428-2429
2430-2431-2432
2433-2434-2435
2436-2437-2438
2439-2440-2441
2442-2443-2444
2445-2446-2447
2448-2449-2450
2451-2452-2453
2454-2455-2456
2457-2458-2459
2460-2461-2462
2463-2464-2465
2466-2467-2468
2469-2470-2471
2472-2473-2474
2475-2476-2477
2478-2479-2480
2481-2482-2483
2484-2485-2486
2487-2488-2489
2490-2491-2492
2493-2494-2495
2496-2497-2498
2499-2500-2501
2502-2503-2504
2505-2506-2507
2508-2509-2510
2511-2512-2513
2514-2515-2516
2517-2518-2519
2520-2521-2522
2523-2524-2525
2526-2527-2528
2529-2530

INTRODUCTION.

I have for some time felt the necessity of writing, and having published, something that would give a full explanation of my views upon the subject of Christian baptism. I feel that I owe it to my family, to a sainted mother, an aged father, and to the thousands of good brothers and sisters who sustained me against the action of the Association, to place myself right before the world, and especially to make known my teachings, which by the dominant party in the Association, were denounced as heretical, unscriptural, and unbaptistic. I am satisfied that when all is made known, it will be for the glory of God and the advancement of His cause.

I have tried to set forth the facts in the difficulty between the Association and myself so that there will be no personalities that can be offensive to the most fastidious. I have tried to speak the truth in love—I have endeavored so to write that my words may be “as apples of gold in pictures of silver.”

I do not wish to rest under the charge of having been, or of being, a heretic. I know I am not AND NEVER WAS. I may have given hasty utterance to sentences that were susceptible legitimately of such construction, but when my teachings are put together,

I am satisfied the Baptist brotherhood will receive me again into the arms of their affection. If however in this I should be mistaken, I know it is best for all concerned that the whole truth should be known. If I am not of the Baptists I do not wish to stay among them. If I am, I want their sympathy and cooperation in the work of preaching the gospel, and in trying to do good.

While this Association difficulty remains unexplained, it will hang around my efforts as an "incubus," preventing me from doing good. There can be no lawful objection urged against setting forth these things. The only objection that can be properly made is the manner in which it is done. I hope therefore the kind reader will first see what I have to say, and then approve or condemn. I submit to the decision of an enlightened public. I submit the case to my brethren. I only ask for a patient and candid hearing from these, and then I abide their decision. Had the church to which I belonged excluded me, I should have ceased to preach, and turned my attention to something else, but I regarded her decision as the voice of God. Here then I rest my cause. The church sustained me. Did she do right? was she guided by the Holy Spirit? If so I ought still to be received by the brotherhood upon equality. I thank God that this has already been the decision of thousands.

I send this little work forth on its mission. May it do good wherever it goes, and may the peace of our Zion abound, and may her cords be lengthened and her stakes strengthened, till all the world shall be brought under the mild reign of Christ.

G. A. C.



DEDICATION.

TO ELDER J. R. GRAVES, of Memphis, Tennessee,
ELDER J. T. FREEMAN, of Corinth, Mississippi,
and the thousands of brethren and sisters in Kentucky and elsewhere, who sympathized with me in the day of my trial,, and who had words of cheer and kindness for me in the darkest hours of my affliction; and who, under God, saved me to a denomination of Christians whose foundation rests upon Christ and the apostles, and whose principles are as old as Christianity itself; and which have stood for more than eighteen hundred years the mighty bulwark of religious liberty, triumphing over every foe, and which is destined to stand till our earth shall be redeemed from its bondage of sin and corruption, and shall then rise from the dust and conflict of ages as an anchor "amid the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds;" this little book is respectfully dedicated, by

THE AUTHOR.



BIOGRAPHY.



I was born in white county, Tennessee, hence the first breath I ever drew was of the pure mountain air so favorable to independence and liberty. My father soon migrated to North Alabama, and there I was reared, amid that wild and romantic scenery so favorable to poetry and song.

My parents being in moderate circumstances, I found it necessary to make my own way in the world. They gave me as good an education as the county afforded. After completing my course in the high school of Professor Madden, in Belleforte, the county seat of Jackson County, in the winter of 1854, I left for Union University, Murfreesboro Tenn., of which Joseph H. Eaton was then the distinguished president. Here I spent more than three years, under the tutelage of such men as Eaton, Pendleton, Worrill, Harris and other intellectual worthies. When the fearful strife began between the North and South, I left for my mountain home in North Alabama. In the fall of 1862 I moved to Aberdeen, Miss., having married, in the early part of the year, in Corinth, Mississippi. Here I spent four years as the pastor of the First Baptist Church of that city, during which

time the Lord blessed my labors, and there were over one hundred persons added to the church by experience and baptism.

In the Spring of 1865, I moved back to North Alabama, and was settled for a time as pastor of the Baptist Church of Tuscumbia. From this I was called to labor as an evangelist for the General Association of North Alabama.

While in this field I made my first visit to Kentucky, and in 1867, moved to this State to take charge of Lynnland Institute in Hardin County. In 1868, I took charge of the Hodgenville Seminary, Larue County. Here I brought my family, and remained for three years, thence I came to my present stopping-place, Campbellsville, Taylor County, Kentucky, and took charge of the High School here.

I was early impressed with the importance of the religion of the Bible. When only about five years of age, I felt that I would one day be a minister. I cannot remember the time when I did not pray to God. I became a regular Sunday-school scholar when about ten years of age. I read with interest, and I trust with profit, the books of the "Sunday-School Union," which some would call "religious novels," but I think they did me much good. I cannot, however, recommend them now, because we can do better. We have better books.

Much of the preaching that I heard in my early youth was of the experimental kind, and had mixed

with it much of the marvelous. So that I formed quite erroneous views of the nature of religion. I took the experiences of christians as they related them, to be very strange things. I thought of religion only in the light of such teaching for several years. Yet I read the Bible a great deal, and earnestly desired to have religion. I once, when quite a small boy, attended a Methodist Camp-Meeting. It was one of those exciting times when every body seemed to be "getting" religion. I had common sense enough to know that this was not as I had read in the New Testament. So, on returning home, I said to my Pa.: If that is religion I do'nt want it. Pa gave me a gentle rebuke by saying: "Yes, my son, *if it is religion* you want it, but you mean you do not think that is religion." I saw that the point was well taken. I said thoughtfully: "Yes, that is what I mean."

I cannot remember the time when I did not regard God as a Sovereign. I imbibed the idea from reading the New Testament while a school boy, that the God of the universe does *all* things just right—that there is an eternal and infinitely wise council and plan in all His works, and all things are being done in accordance with that plan. I was not a *Christian*, yet I can say that I admired the council of God displayed in His works; I stood in awe of His holiness and the greatness of His power. The leading denominations of professed christians in North Alabama in the days of my childhood were Baptists (Regular and

Free-will), Methodists, Presbyterians (Cumberland and Old School), and Episcopalians. I looked favorably upon all as christians, and for some time thought that there was not a great deal of difference between them. I was slightly prejudiced in favor of the Regular Baptists. I thought in their preaching they did so much honor God and abase man, yet they were so zealous for the cause of truth as it seemed to me they ought to be, and they seemed to be a little stingy in regard to the pay of their preachers.

My grandfather and grandmother on my father's side belonged to this order. My father and mother were professors, or at least, as they expressed it, *had a hope*, but did not belong to any church. My mother was somewhat of an Armenian—my father a Calvinist. I therefore was inclined to the "golden meen."

I grew up with the impression that every body ought to be religious, and always laid the flattering unction to my soul, that at some future time, I would seek and obtain the "pearl of great price," but I put it off from day to day, and from year to year. In the time of my youth, when most persons are gayest and seem to have the least thought of death, "when the youthful heart is fired by the afflatus of hopes that borrow the hues of Iris,"

"When hope with radiant finger points us
To rosy meads by Bennemere's stream,"

I was troubled with the thought that I must die. I prayed much and would sometimes feel as if I was

heard in my prayers, and that the Lord had accepted me as one of the elect. I once heard a good brother of the Freewill Baptists preach a very good sermon. He then gave a very warm exhortation, calling on sinners to come up and give him the hand, who wished the prayers of the people of God. I wanted to go, Oh! so much, but I could not. I cannot tell why. I wanted them to pray for me, but to ask it, it seemed I could not. I let the moment pass—days, months and years passed, and still I stood between two, waiting for an opportunity more favorable. When I was about fifteen years old, I heard for the first time a missionary Baptist preacher. He produced quite a sensation. He was called “money-hunter.” I was on the ground before services began; they were held at the Freewill Baptist house of worship. Many of the old brethren had gathered in early. In a group of these I was standing out in the yard, when the money question was sprung. All, with one united voice, condemned the “money-hunter,” saying preachers should go and preach “without money and without price.” I, though a boy, soon saw from the tenor of their conversation, that they did not understand the teachings of the New Testament upon the subject; hence I mildly suggested to them that it seemed to me to be clearly taught in the New Testament that ministers ought to be paid, and that churches ought to send them out. Paul said that he robbed other churches that he might preach the

gospel to the Thessalonians. Jesus said at one time to His disciples, "take neither purse nor scrip for your journey," but at another time he said to them prepare yourselves with such things. Paul said; "If you be partakers of our spiritual things, is it not right that we should partake of your carnal things." At first they looked with surprise, as much as to say, where did you get all that from. But one of them began to question me on the subject, and it was not long till they all agreed that it might be as I said. We went into the house and heard the sermon. All were much pleased. In five years from that time, the Freewill Baptists were numbered among the things that were. Church after church changed, till the Association went over, and the Association of Freewills was made the Association of Missionaries. Many of the Primitives came over to them, and not a few Methodists and Presbyterians, several preachers among the number.

In the spring of 1855, my oldest brother, who is only two years older than myself, made a profession of religion. I had no rest day nor night, till I found myself the possessor of the blessed hope. I went to the mourners' bench; yes, I went into the altar of the Methodist church, and at a Baptist meeting, I went up to be prayed for. I was "beset by the devil," as old John Bunyan says. I first felt that I had sinned away my day of grace; and then I was beset with doubts as to the very existence of a God. All

the powers of darkness seemed to be turned loose upon me. When I would try to pray it seemed that my prayers were empty words. I could not feel as I had felt. My soul was sorrowful. I knew not what to do. I had often heard Methodist and Cumberland Presbyterian ministers assert that any one could get religion at any time. I felt a contempt for the teaching. I saw it was not true. I wanted to believe in God. I wanted to love Him. I wanted to claim Him as my father. Oh! I would have given worlds to be a christian! But it was all of no avail—the more I tried to pray the less I felt like it—the more I studied and tried to find out God, the more impenetrable the darkness became. Darker and darker all things grew, till I feared there was no mercy for me. One day, when alone in the field, I thought I saw, as it were, Jacob's ladder. My thoughts ran out, and I felt the truth—there is a God, and He can save me. Some light was given—my heart was changed—I felt towards christians as I had never felt before. I loved them with a holy love. *I loved them because they were christians.* I loved them because I thought they loved God. But this I did not take for religion. I was still expecting to find religion such a thing as my imagination had pictured it to be—something to shake me, and make me indiscribably happy, so that I would leap, and shout, and swoon and see sights.

In the month of October of the same year, 1855,

I attended a protracted meeting held by Bro. R. H. Taliafarro, who has since gone to his reward. Many persons professed religion. I heard them tell their experience. Mine egreed with the more sober and discreet, but I still thought I must see wonders or hear sounds, and I supposed that these had, but that they did not tell it. One night the preacher told his experience. I listened with interest, for I was interested.

He prefaced what he had to say upon the subject by remarking, that he did not wish any one to take his experience for theirs, and that a Bible experience was the best of all experiences. To take the teachings of the New Testament, and compare ourselves with that. If we could find our experience to correspond with that, we need have no fears. I do not know that I ever heard anything that did me more good. I caught the idea at once. That was it—Bible religion. To be in harmony with the New Testament. I said this requires faith in our Lord Jesus Christ—nothing more, *nothing more*. I said I will take God at His word. I will believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as my Savior. I felt happy. I thanked God for the gracious word—it was “manna” to my hungry soul. I went forward the next night and told my state of mind to the church—was received as a candidate for baptism and membership. The New Testament seemed a new book—even the

chapters that I had committed to memory in the Sunday school seemed as if I had never read them before. I read, and rejoiced in each promise, and these were very great and precious.

At this time I was baptized into the fellowship of the church at Centre Point, Jackson County, Alabama. There were about forty baptized during the meeting, which lasted only two weeks. One year after this, I related to the brethren my impressions and desires to preach the gospel of the blessed Son of God. They heard with surprise and joy, believing the Lord had called me to the work. My impressions were briefly these. I saw much wickedness in the world around me. I felt that each individual had an immortal soul to be saved, or it must perish. I felt the truth that it is by the foolishness of preaching that men are saved. I felt that God had saved me—that Jesus had died for me—that the Spirit of faith, hope and love had been given. I felt that there was a fullness for all that would come to Christ—the fountain of life.

Night after night, when others were asleep, I lay on my bed, pondering what could be done to save my neighbors and friends. I fully believed in the power of the gospel to save. I wanted to tell to poor sinners the story of the cross—the love of God—the power of Jesus to save. I said in my thoughts, if I was an eloquent man—if I could talk as I could

think, surely they would hear. Sometimes I would almost get my consent to try to preach, then Satan would suggest ; you are of a stammering tongue and slow of speech—what could you do? But impelled by God's grace and love, I finally consented; but when I made known my impressions, and the brethren received me as a candidate for the ministry, a temptation was offered. I was told that there was a vacancy in the Cadetship at West Point, and that our congressman would secure the place for me if I wished it. God had no doubt wisely ordered it that I should have spoken to the church about preaching previous to this, or the temptation would have been too much for me. But God, that doeth all things well, gave me grace to answer no—to prefer to be a soldier of the cross, to being a soldier of my country. I determined to take a thorough course in theology, and at the same time a regular scientific course. For this purpose I at once entered upon my course at Union University, Mufreesboro, Tennessee.

The question was raised as to the propriety of going to school for three or four years, while sinners were daily dying. I said Jesus, come in the "*fullness of time.*" four thousand years after the creation of man. His disciples remained with him to receive His instructions for three years. So I said God requires men to preach when they are qualified. My time is in his hands. I felt while in college prepar-

ing to preach, that I was doing my duty as much as when I was preaching. I have even felt that it was time well spent, and that it was God's will that it should be so. I say this much for the benefit of young ministers who may read this little book. While at college, under the instructions of Elder J. M. Pendleton, now Dr. Pendleton, I studied Horn's Introduction to Theology, Dr. Dick's Theology, Ripley's Sacred Rhetoric and Dr. Dagg's Theology. I read Melvin's Sermons and first and second volumes of Spurgeon's Sermons. I was a constant reader of the Tennessee Baptist, edited by Elder J. R. Graves, then of Nashville, Tennessee, and the Southwestern Baptist, edited by Talliaferro and Henderson, Tuskegee, Alabama.

While in college, I was called as the pastor of the Roseville church, thirty miles from Murfreesboro, served it, preaching Saturday and Sunday in each month, for near two years. I also served the Concord church, near Nashville, as assistant pastor, for more than a year, in conjunction with Bro. Stephenson of Murfreesboro. My relation with these churches was very pleasant. I had much sweet communion with the brethren. When the war between North and South broke out, I returned home to wait the providence of God. I said I would go into the southern army as a chaplain ; or I would accept the pastorate of a church. In the fall of 1861, I was called to take

charge of the church at Athens, Alabama. Here I spent a year in peril. War, the scourge of nations, raged with fury around us, yet I was permitted to continue my labors for the churches uninterrupted, save by the din of battle. The Methodists and Cumberlands had their houses taken as hospitals, while ours remained untouched by the army. In the fall of 1862, I went to Aberdeen, Mississippi. I took charge of the church at Aberdeen the first of January, 1863. I was here surrounded by difficulties.—The war was raging in its fury—every body was excited—no one could tell what to do. I entered upon my work with fear and trembling. The church numbered about three hundred, whites and blacks. In the month of July afterwards, there was a lady from the Methodist church came forward and asked membership in our church. I baptized her on Sunday morning, and preached a discourse upon the subject of Christian Baptism. I saw there was a deep feeling in the congregation. At night the services seemed to be still more interesting. I announced preaching again for to-morrow night, and thus from night to night. The meeting continued forty days, and we baptized just forty. The church was much revived, and so thorough was the work that we were enabled, by the grace of God, to keep the church in working order till the close of the war. And from time to time, others were added.

In the winter of 1865-6, I felt it my duty to close my connection with this church. Some time in January, 1866, I resigned, and was called immediately to the care of the church at Tuscumbia, Alabama. My stay in Aberdeen was a pleasant one, and I left with reluctance the many kind brethren and friends there. They will have a place in my heart while memory maintains its place in my brain.

I spent nine months as pastor of the church at Tuscumbia. After this I was elected by the board of the North Alabama General Association corresponding secretary and evangelist. I spent six months in this field, and did a prodigious amount of labor. God gave me strength for the work—the brethren received me kindly wherever I went, and the cause of truth and righteousness seemed to triumph. In the deep poverty of the country the brethren abounded in liberality. I was sustained on the field—I preached from place to place. The other preachers in the Association took up the sword, and we made the enemy give way. God did great things for us during that year. A large number was added to the churches in the bounds of the General Association; perhaps more than in any year since. I met on the field many Regular Baptists who gave me the right hand of fellowship, and with the left hand they gave me a dollar, not for the General Association, but for Mrs. Coulson and the children. May God bless them—it

was all the same to me, for I was enabled to preach the gospel, and so I rejoiced and will rejoice.

An incident occurred in one of the mountain districts which I hope will not be uninteresting here. I met with one of the leading members of a Primitive Baptist church. (This is the name of the Regulars in North Alabama). We spent the night together. He took me to task about preaching for money, and also for preaching to all the world. He said, "God has His chosen sheep in the world and will bring them in in His own good time." I did not wish to enter into any argument with the brother, so I admitted all he said on the subject of God's sovereignty, but said, "does not God save them by the preaching of the gospel?" He replied, "yes." "Then, the gospel must be preached," I said, "that they may be saved, and this is just why I am preaching, that God may by His Gospel preached by me, save those lost sheep. I am looking after those chosen ones that they may be saved." The argument was convincing—he gave me a contribution, and told me to continue in the good work. I was only six months in this work, but so much was accomplished that it has always appeared as a year to me. I met many a friend and brother, on that field, that will always hold a place in my heart.

I made two visits during my connection with the Association as financial agent to Kentucky. The last

in May, when I visited a goodly number of churches in Hardin County, which gave me good cheer; yea, they received me as an angel. It was while on this visit I met with brother J. Tol. Miller, and the trustees of Lynnland Institute.

On my arrival home, I received a letter from them of my election to the position of Principal of the Institute. I conferred with the board of the General Association, and after consultation, they agreed to give me up, as my deep poverty was such that it was thought necessary for me to make more permanent arrangements for the support of my family. I arrived on the field of labot, in Kentucky, the last of August—assisted brother J. Tol. Miller in a protracted meeting at Gilead church, for eight days. The Lord was with us, and some sixteen or seventeen were added by experience and baptism.

I was called in September of this year, (1867), to the care of the church at White Mills. In December, I was called to take charge of Bethel church. The church in Hodgenville called me in January, 1868. I took charge of it in February or March. In May, I was called to the care of South Fork church, in Larue County. The prospect of doing much good cheered me for a while. Large congregations attended my ministry, and numbers were being added to my churches. But at this time the devil got in among us, and made sad havoc of our peace and prospects.

A great moral (?) simoon was about to sweep over the churches, destroying our influence for good. Good brethren were at variance. There was much bickering, back-biting and evil speaking. I suffered, no one can tell how much. Brethren suffered; but it seemed that nothing could be done to heal the breach. Who was most to blame of mortals may not be known on earth. Eternity will reveal.

Of these stirring times I will not now speak—as a succinct history will come up in the body of this work.

I am now too near the living present to make any farther history interesting to the general reader. So I will close this biographical sketch, asking pardon for having said so much about myself. I thought, as I was going to write *about* myself, it would not be uninteresting to let the reader know how I happened to be here—from whence I came. I now proceed to tell my story of the Salem Association difficulty. I ask a careful reading and a righteous judgment.

CHAPTER. I.

RISE AND PROGRESS OF THE DOCTRINE.

“There is no promise in the New Testament to the unbaptized as such.” In the winter of 1864-5, while I was in Aberdeen, Mississippi, as pastor of the first Baptist church of that place, I was asked by the Methodist station preacher, a Mr. See, to tell him why we could not commune with Methodists, and why they were not permitted to commune with us.

I gave him substantially the following answer:

We have two churches—you belong to the *one*, and *I* to the *other*. All the reasons that can be given to justify the separation in church must apply to the communion. If the Baptist church is the Lord's church, then you ought to belong to it. This you cannot do with your present views. If the Methodist church is the Lord's church, then *I* ought to belong to *it*; but my views must be changed before you can receive me. Now, if *you* are not a fit subject for church membership, you are *not* for the table—if I am not fit to be a member of the church, then I am not fit to come to the communion. He answered: *“It is the Lord's table.”* I replied: *“It is the Lord's church.”* “But you acknowledge we are christians,” said he. “Yes,” I replied, “but not church mem-

bers.” “Why not admit us then as christians, to the table?” he asked. I replied, “we think church membership is necessary in order for any one to come to the communion.”

This conversation occurred on the street. I went home to ponder over the matter, and to search the Scriptures. I had read, three years previous to this, “Broker’s Prize Essay on Communion.” After searching the Scriptures for a few days, I became convinced that—“*Whatever was necessary for church membership was necessary to christianity.*” That baptism and church membership were not connected—baptism, however, preceeding church membership. I saw that faith in Christ was the only thing absolutely essential to salvation, but I saw that baptism always *immediately* followed this; so that in the days of the Apostles there were properly speaking no unbaptized christians. The disciples found at Ephesus by Paul being the only exception—if indeed this be a case—but these were supposed to have been baptized, for Paul said, “Unto what then were ye baptized?” “And they said unto John’s baptism.” Acts xix.

Jesus said, “upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” But Peter had just said, “thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.” So the church of Christ is built upon the confession, *that Jesus is the Christ.* The Apostles received into their number all those who

professed Christ—but all these were immediately baptized. I re-read brother Broker's Essay on Communion. It did not satisfy me. I went to work to re-investigate the whole question.

I raised the question as to who are entitled to the appellation, disciple or christian. I determined to settle the question in the light of the teachings of the New Testament. Here I lost sight of the communion question, only in so far as it would incidently come up. I read and thought much. *I tried to pray.* To be a christian is to be like Christ, to be a disciple is to be a follower of Christ. To be entitled to the promise, one must be obedient to Christ.

"Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you," is the teaching of the Divine Master.

I spent a year or more investigating the question, "*Who are Christians?*" when I arrived at the following conclusion: Christians love God, hate sin, love one another and strive to keep all the commands of Christ. 1. They have all been born of God. 2. They have repented of their sins. 3. They have believed in Jesus as the Christ, and have accepted of him as their Savior. 4. In the days of the Apostles they were all baptized. It could then be said they have all been baptised. Here, then, the trouble began. My Baptist brethren regard the unbaptized as Christians—that is, *those who are not now and never intend to be baptized.* I said, are we not wrong

in this opinion? Can it be so, that the Bible is a plain book, "so that a way-faring man though a fool need not err therein;" that a man may read as he runs and understand as he reads? And is it so that all the disciples of Christ have been taught of God, born of the Spirit, and are led by the Spirit, and yet the millions of Pedo-Baptists and sprinklers and pourers will not see the truth—i. e. *cannot*, and yet they are all Christians? All the disciples, i. e. the followers of our Lord Jesus Christ? Can it be so, that these have *denied* themselves and taken up their crosses and are following Christ? I was slow to answer *no*, but how could I answer *yes*?

In the fall of 1866 I prepared and preached the following sermon:

"OBEDIENCE NECESSARY TO MANIFEST FAITH.

'Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee.'—Samuel xv. 22, 23.

The chapter before us contains the command of God to Saul, through his servant Samuel, to go and utterly destroy all the Amalekites, and all that they had. Saul went and fought against them, routed them, destroyed them till none were left save the king, Agag. Some of the best of the sheep and oxen are

spared to make, as Saul said, a sacrifice to the Lord God of Israel. Saul was disobedient, therefore, to the divine command, in this he egregiously sinned. Not that there was anything wrong in the keeping of the King alive, or in making a sacrifice to God of these cattle and sheep; but *in that he did not obey the voice of the Lord*. And yet he did do much that was commanded him. His sin consisted then in the failure to obey fully what he was commanded to do. How fearful to trifle with the requirements of Jehovah! Let us notice the sequel.

I. *Faith manifests itself in obedience, not in sacrifice.* "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous. God testifying of his gifts, and by it he being dead yet speaketh." Cain brought his offering to the Lord; it was the fruit of the ground. Abel brought his; this was of the "firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof." "The Lord had respect unto Abel and his offering." Notice carefully—it was by FAITH that Abel offered the more excellent sacrifice. But Cain brought a sacrifice. Was his not of faith? Did he not expect God to accept his offering? Did he not have faith? I answer, *he did not*. An animal sacrifice was the requirement of God. I am satisfied of this, though it is not so stated. Sacrifices no doubt began with the fall. Animals were slain to get skins to clothe Ad-

and Eve. Christ must be shadowed forth; blood must flow. Abel believed in God—so did Cain; but Abel accepted of God as revealed, hence he brought the sacrifice God required. Cain substituted a sacrifice of his own. He left out Christ and proposed to please God by his own good deeds. The man who does not take God at his word, and do just what he requires, cannot be said to have faith. He may believe that God is, and that he ought to be worshiped, but if he take his own way he is destitute of faith. Presumption and faith are similar in some things, but quite different in others. Cain presumed that the Lord would accept of his sacrifice. Abel believed, i. e. had faith to believe, that God would accept of his. Abel received the promised blessing; Cain did not. The children of Israel crossed the Red Sea by faith. They were commanded of God to go across. The Egyptians *presumed* that they could cross; but were drowned. Faith led Israel to attempt the crossing; Presumption led Egypt to attempt the same. Faith, then, *is the taking of God at his word and doing just what he requires*; i. e. this is the *manifestation of faith*. Abel, though dead, speaks, speaks yet, and we should hear his voice. No substituted sacrifice will answer. “*Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.*”

.II. *Faith is manifested in doing JUST what God commands*—NOTHING more. Moses was commanded to speak to the rock. He smote it twice. God had not said thou shalt not smite the rock, but he had said “speak to the rock.” A high and holy faith would have taken God at his word. Presumption led Moses to take the rod and *smite* the rock. “And the Lord God spake unto Moses and Aaron, Because ye *believed me not*, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, Therefore ye *shall not bring* this congregation into the land which I have given them.”

Moses was permitted to see the promised land from the top of Nebo, but not to go over into it. He sinned in that he did not obey the voice of the Lord. The command to *speak* to the rock was a prohibition of everything else. In the New Testament the command to *baptize believers* excludes all others. To baptize unbelievers, children or adults, is to reject the command of Christ, and fail to glorify him in the sight of the people. It manifests a want of faith in Christ, when any one does for His command what he has not commanded. Uzza touched the Ark of the Lord when the oxen stumbled. God smote him, so that he died. He had not been commanded to keep his herds from the Ark directly; but God had said that no *unholy*, that is, unsanctified persons should touch the Ark, or any of its vessels. Uzza did not belong to the priesthood, hence he could not touch

the Ark with impunity. It was *presumption* in him to do so, not *faith*. It was sin, and God punished it as such. His good intentions availed him nothing here. How fearful to trifle with the commands of God! Faith, that is pleasing to God, that saves the soul, will ever manifest itself in doing just what Christ requires of us. And if we are unwilling to do this, we may rightly fear that we want *the* faith. The outward action is the index to the state of the heart. For God has, in infinite wisdom, given us his commands, so that we may know what he would have us to do. Hence, if we do not those things which He has commanded, it shows that our hearts are not right in the sight of God. To say that we do not know what God has required of us, is to deny that we have a revelation from him; for a revelation that we cannot understand, is the same as having none at all.

III. *The faith that will save us, will make us obey.* Naaman, the Syrian Leper, had faith enough to cause him to get ready his gifts and go to Israel to see the prophet that he might heal him of his leprosy. But when the prophet sent word to him to go and dip himself seven times in Jordan, he despised both the prophet and his manner of healing. He turned away in his wrath. Here was a manifestation of the true state of his heart, which, up to this time, seemed to be all right. God put his faith to the test in this manner of curing. He refused to obey the command,

and in doing this rejected the prophet. How many thousands have felt the burden of sin, and have heard of Christ as the Great Prophet, and have started to him in pride, thinking how much they would do for him when he should heal them. But when they are told that all that is required is faith in Jesus as the Christ who was crucified for us, and rose for our justification, have stumbled at the word and despised the cross. Now it must be manifest to all that a want of faith made Naaman reject the means of the cure offered by the Prophet. A sinner coming to God for salvation manifests a want of faith when he turns aside from the cross of Christ. But the true faith that saves is that which brings us low at the foot of the cross, and makes us say of him who died upon it, "My Lord and my God." Hence to the saved he becomes at once the Great Prophet to teach us, our Great High Priest to offer for us the only sacrifice for sin; our King, to rule and govern in our hearts. Had Naaman not dipped himself in the Jordan, he would have died a leper. If a sinner receives not our Lord Jesus as the Christ, as his Saviour, he will perish in his sins. But he who receives Christ will with him receive his commands. If he receive not his commands he receives not him. If we do not certainly know the commands of Christ, we are under no obligations to obey them; i. e. if we can not know them. On the night of the Passover Moses commanded the children of Israel to prepare

the Pascal Lamb, and sprinkle the blood upon the doors. They manifested their faith in doing what God required of them through Moses, his prophet. By faith they sprinkled this blood, and hence were delivered by faith. Jesus commands us to be baptized, i. e. immersed. To refuse to do this is a manifestation of the want of faith, and argues that the man has not submitted to Christ. There is no Romish tendency here. The argument is that the refusal to obey, shows the want of faith. Obedience *manifests* faith; disobedience, the want of it. If Christ intended his people to obey this command in all ages, then he gave it in plain terms, so that they can understand it. And if the heart is right the penitent sinner, believing in Jesus, will follow his master into the water.

The blind man, commanded by Jesus to go and wash in the pool of Siloan, went and washed and came seeing. He manifested here his faith in *going*—in going to the *pool*—in going to the *pool of Siloan*.

Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." A sinner is saved through faith in Christ. The saved are baptized, because they have believed. Adam was commanded not to eat of the Tree of Knowledge. God tested him just here. He **took** and eat; a world was lost. Jesus came to save. He gave one simple ordinance or command by which a world might manifest its willingness to come back

to God. Hence he connected faith and baptism—faith the sequence, baptism the consequence. When they believed they were baptized. But, the objector says, why so much stress upon baptism? Are not other commands as important? I answer they are. God has said, “Thou shalt not lie.” Now if a man persist in lying all his life do you say he is a christian, because he does many other things in accordance with the requirements of Christ? Suppose professed christians, as the Mormons for instance, should always live in adultery, would you say “*these will be saved?* These are christians?”

IV. *Good intentions are not manifestatsons of faith, neither is a zeal for God's cause.* Paul had, no doubt, the very best intentions when he as a Jew was zealous for the religion of his fathers. Paul intended to do just right, hence he had, as he thought, a good conscience. He did have a *quiet* conscience. His zeal was unbounded for the honor of the Jewish religion, which he supposed to be very pleasing to God. Saul of Tarsus verily believed he ought to do all that he did in persecuting the christians. He had as good intentions then as he had when, with tears, he warned the people of sin, and urged them to embrace the Saviour and become christians. Saul of Tarsus had as much zeal for God as Paul the Apostle. How strange! What makes the difference? Paul has faith; Paul is a believer; yea, more than this, Saul has been changed to Paul, by the direct opera-

tion of the Holy Spirit upon his heart. God has given him his Spirit, so that he is now led into "*all truth.*" Paul does not tarry, he arises and is baptized, and straitway preaches Jesus that he is the Christ. His zeal is all that it was before—perhaps nothing more; nothing less. But it is according to knowledge. Paul is not *disobedient* to the divine requirement. He obeys the voice of the Lord. Do not all *christians* do this? Can a man be said to be a disciple, a christian, a follower of Christ, who does not obey him? We cannot rightly regard such as disciples.

I call your attention to the following climax: "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." "He that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be saved." "He that *endureth to the end*, the same shall be saved." "He that doeth righteousness is righteous." "*He that committeth sin is of the devil.*" But, my brethren, it has been declared by Jesus, "that he became the author of eternal salvation to all those who *obey* him." Faith precedes, and obedience follows salvation. He that has not the obedience has not the faith, and hence is without the promise. He who rejects baptism as not being essential to his christianity, rejects the commands of Christ; *there is no promise to him.*

This sermon did much to arouse the church and community. Many began to search the Scriptures to

see if these things were so. A short time after this I attended the Aberdeen Association—was appointed to preach, at 11 o'clock on Sunday, and by request of one of my members from Aberdeen I preached the same sermon in substance. In the spring of 1866 I was called to the care of the church at Tuscombia, Alabama. A short time after this I attended a called meeting for the purpose of organizing the North Alabama General Association, at Moulton, Ala. I was again appointed to preach on Sunday, at 11 o'clock. I preached this sermon again. Some brethren of the Reformation present claimed me as their Baptist preacher. But I know that I can say in truth, *the voice of the Baptists in North Alabama, after hearing me time and again, was that my teachings were perfectly orthodox.*

In the fall of the same year, about eight months after this, I was chosen clerk of the Mussels Shoals Association. And when the business was over, by way of compliment, the brethren gave me a vote of thanks and the sum of twenty-five dollars for my services.

On the first of January, 1867, I was chosen by the Board of the General Association to ride as an evangelist and general agent for the Association. At the meeting of the General Association, in the month of November, 1866, I had been elected Corresponding Secretary; so that, after January 1st, I was Evangelist, Agent, and Corresponding Secretary. I

labored in this field till July 1st, 1867, when I resigned and came to Kentucky. During my stay in Tuscumbia I went to my room, and, after trying to pray for the Divine guidance, I took up my Testament to read it through, determined not to let any of my previous opinions or the teachings that I had received have any bias upon my mind. I tried to read it as if it were for the first and last time. I had no question before me but *what does this book teach?* As I read slowly day by day I drank in its living waters. I began to read to learn for myself. Here was the beginning of the doctrine: "No promise to the unbaptized as such." And here, for the first time, I fully embraced the great doctrines of God's sovereignty, and salvation by grace. I read in Matthew, i. 21, "And thou shalt call his name JESUS, for he shall save his people from their sins." I paused and reasoned thus: Jesus, means Saviour. A Saviour implies some one to save; this implies that some are lost. Jesus is a Saviour sent of God. God is omnipotent. He sent Jesus his Son into the world to save his people. Jesus is God the Son. He came to save; hence some are to be saved. This, in the very nature of the case, implies that Jesus has a people on the earth; these he came to save. But it would be impossible to know that he would save some, without knowing how many; for no revelation is made to God. But if he knew how many, he knew who they were. Therefore, these were chosen in Christ before

the foundation of the world, and Christ came to save them. Hence, from the beginning, the number were specific, definite. The saved account all their salvation to God. For, since it is not a matter of chance or accident who will be saved, then it is certain; and God, by his grace, will bring in the elect. God the Holy Spirit moves upon the heart, changes the affections, and the soul cries out after God. The gospel is sent to these, the called of God, and it is to them the power and wisdom of God; hence these believe and are saved. But the proposition is to save from sin; so then we will have obedience to follow. The grace that will save in heaven will save on earth.

Thus I reasoned and thus I preached, and no marvel for thus it is throughout the New Testament. When I would preach three classes of persons were united, and each claimed me. The Regular Baptists, the Reformers, and the Missionary Baptists, which were my people. The same sermon was received by all. So you see it was God's truth that united them, and not me, and thus it would ever be if these people were left to themselves. It has always been the preachers that have kept these three denominations apart. A Regular Baptist becomes a disputant, and hence he does nothing but look up his texts and preach his side of the question. God's sovereignty is his theme everywhere. The Reformer takes works; baptism, prominent among the requirements, he dwells much upon this. The Missionary tries to oc-

cupy the "golden mean." But if the Regular, or "hardshell" Baptists, as they are sometimes called, prevails in the community, then the Missionary comes to the other extreme, and will always be crying "work, work;" if the Campbellite element, then he leans away from them to the *other* side. Regular Baptists and Reformers have much of truth in their teachings. This should be recognized, and we should show to both that since we agree upon many points, we should be glad to have them come and go with us. I believed then, and believe it still, that the righteous element in both these denominations will one day bring them back to us—i. e. that we three will one day be united upon the "OLD LAND-MARK RESET;" and this will be a day of triumph for the truth. I have seen enough of the hair-splitting to know that when it is all over and the people sit down to read God's Word, and compare themselves with this, that we are much nearer together than the would-be leaders try to make us believe. I have preached for a week at a time, day by day, and had these people to fully receive my teachings, and rejoice in the love of God together. Of course this was not so with every individual, but with the real pious portion of each congregation or denomination. I published a sermon in the Christian Herald in the spring of 1867, in which I took this position. There is a call for God's people to go up and possess the land—i. e. this country. These are the baptized,

and these alone can do the work. All Protestant denominations have so much of Romanism in their teachings, that it is impossible for them to do us any good in the army. We can only succeed when we go up as God's circumcised, i. e. baptized. We could take the country if we were united; and my prayer is that God may soon bring this about.

On my arrival in Kentucky I was received by the brethren with open arms, and as it was in North Alabama and Mississippi, so it was in this State. The Regular Baptists received me, and the Reformers also took me into their houses and treated me as a brother. I was kindly treated by all the people; but the Pedo-Baptists could not receive me as a brother; of course, I did not expect this. They are in opposition, as a people, to the triumph of our doctrines, and they cannot be consistent with themselves and endorse us, neither can we endorse them. Preaching and teaching, I tried to do my duty as a Baptist and as a christian. I never stopped a moment to consider the question of popularity. I said to the brethren, if we are to have a Baptist school let us have one, and teach the doctrine of our church, which we regard as the doctrines of the Bible. The church flourished, the school was doing well. All things seemed to prosper. The people were reading the Bible as they had not read it for years; God was at work.

And just here I wish to relate a little of my expe-

rience. I am satisfied that from the time I fully embraced the doctrine that we must be baptized to manifest the fact that we are christians, and that all Pedo-Baptists are in error, such vital error that they cannot be regarded as the disciples of Christ, I loved God more, the Bible more, and read it more; loved christians more, loved them for the truth's sake, than I ever did before. I was free from temptation—felt more like preaching, trembled more at the vast responsibility of preaching, than I ever did before. I cannot account for it, but from the day I cut loose from all the so-called societies as churches or christians, I felt a new life spring up in my soul. And O! how bitter the day, when I gave up all as lost. When I saw and felt that my own baptized brethren could do so many things that were contrary to the spirit of true religion, I grieved over it from day to day till at last I concluded to try the matter. I took the most liberal view possible toward all professed christians. I have now tried Pedo-Baptists for three years, and my honest conviction is that there are very few of them that take any interest in Baptist churches.

CHAPTER. II.

FIRST YEAR IN KENTUCKY.

I arrived in Kentucky with my family on Friday, August 6, 1867. According to a previous appointment I went to Gilead church, on Sunday following, to assist Bro. J. Tol. Miller in a protracted meeting. Bro. Miller preached the first sermon, at 11 o'clock; I preached at 2 P. M. After this I preached twice a day for eight days, except one. Bro. I. W. Bruner preached at 11 o'clock on Friday. The meeting closed on Monday, August 19. Sixteen were baptized by Bro. Miller. We had a pleasant time; God was with us, and the church was much revived.

Some one speaking to Bro. J. J. Jeffrey, after the meeting was over, said: "The Reformers are claiming Bro. Coulson." "I have heard so," he replied, "but I followed him closely during the entire meeting, and he did not go anywhere but what I could go with him. I confess, however," he said, "that Bro. Coulson came the nearest the water of any man I ever heard to keep out." This endorsement by Bro. Jeffrey was a great consolation to me, for I was satisfied no one in the Salem Association was more capable of judging, and I knew that he had watched me closely. I had seen him as he sat before me during the meeting. I see those expressive eyes now,

in my imagination, as he would look at me with his countenance all radiant with hope and joy. He has passed away, but his words of encouragement have been a solace to me. I never pass Gilead church without a sigh. What a bright future she had in prospect in the fall of 1867, and the spring of 1868. And yet, who can tell what is in the future! I had a kind of presentiment then that a storm was to burst over me, but little dreamed how *terrible* it would be.

Bro. J. Tol. Miller was at this time one of the leading ministers of the Association, and pastor of some three or four of her best churches. I never received more kindness or hospitality from any man than from him. He took me in—a stranger—and did all that friendship or christianity could demand. May he find favor with the Lord Jesus in the day of his coming. He introduced me to his churches, he recommended me wherever he went to the kind consideration of the brethren. I loved him then, and I *know* I love him still. What his feelings are toward me, I know not; but I have not ceased to hope that the day may come when we will meet around the same altar of prayer and praise again. I may not have treated him as I ought, but one thing I know, I never have indulged for one moment a spirit of malice or hatred towards him, although I was satisfied he did me some wrong—I still hope he did not so intend it. One thing, I cannot cease to love him.

LYNNLAND INSTITUTE.

On Monday, September 9, 1867, I commenced my labors as Principal of the Institute. We commenced with fifty scholars, and gradually increased to the close of the session, when we had eighty-seven. I labored hard for the success of the school. I found in the Trustees Samuel Hendsbrough, William Sprigg, Henry Sprigg, Samuel Sprigg, J. R. Gaither, F. W. Simmons, and J. J. Jeffries, the best of friends; they assisted me in my time of poverty and need. They, with their families, showed me so many kindnesses that I can never forget them. It almost draws tears from my eyes to call up those days of love and friendship. I loved their children almost as my own, and they seemed never to tire of doing me favors. May they find peace in the day of His coming, who shall judge the world in righteousness. Some of them have been alienated from me, yet I can but hope the day will come when we will see alike and that they take me back again into their affections. I loved them then; I loved their families. O! how painful it was to give them up! But I felt that I must bear all things for Christ's sake. May we yet know "How good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

SALEM ASSOCIATION.

On Saturday, the 21st of September, 1867, I attended for the first time the meeting of Salem Asso-

ciation. It was at White Mills, in Hardin county. I got in about ten o'clock, heard a short discussion on the circular letter, written by Elder Robert Enlow. In this letter, he had taken the position that the human and the divine nature of Christ were diametrically opposed to each other. The position was sustained by a final vote, and so sent forth to the world. I mention this fact to show that Associations do not always vote the sentiment or opinions of the Baptist denomination. Ten minutes to eleven o'clock a short recess was given, and appointments announced for preaching at the stand. Dr. South and Bro. Judson Brown were to preach. Bro. South had entered into the discussion of the question before the Association and asked to be excused. I was requested to preach in his place. I consented, and it was in the sermon preached that day, in the midst of hurried declamation that I first used the words: "*There is no promise in the New Testament to the unbaptized as such.*" I did not think just how it would look put in print. I never dreamed at that time that I would ever see any of that sermon in a newspaper. Had I deliberated on the thought I would have put it into about such words as these: There is no promise to the man who is not now and never intends to be baptized. I am satisfied, however, that it would never have been noticed, had it not been for the fact that the Reformers noticed it, and claimed me as their preacher. This called the attention of a Bap-

tist minister, and he spoke of it to others. By a special invitation of the brethren at White Mills I preached for the church Sunday, October 13, 1867. At the first regular meeting of the church after the meeting of the Association, I was called as pastor of the church to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Bro. I. W. Bruner. I commenced my labors with the church as pastor on the 26th of October, 1867. Baptized two the first day I preached for them. In going down into the water with the candidates, I called the attention of the large audience gathered on the water's edge to the fact that we did not baptize these persons to make them christians, but because they are christians. I said: "This fact they now manifest by following Christ in his appointed ordinance." One of the candidates had been a Methodist for many years. He said, "I have often had doubts about my baptism, but rested easy about the matter, thinking it a matter of no consequence, until I heard you preach that sermon at the Association." He said, "I felt as if it were a sin to neglect it a moment longer." He was an intelligent gentleman, and made us a good member.

From this time I commenced my labors at the Institute. I preached regularly at Bethel and Nolin churches, supplying them as pastor for Bro. J. Tol. Miller. On Sunday, December 15, 1867, I preached at Nolin church on the Communion question, it be-

ing communion season. I took the position that it is the church that communes, and each individual member is bound, by the law of love, to be present at such time and set forth Christ's death: "For as often as we do this we show forth the Lord's death till he come."

I took the position that the church, in the aggregate, is the bride of Christ, and that it is this that is to be received and presented before the Father. I showed that the promises are to the church, and then that the church consists of baptized members. Here, then, we rest our cause, I said, and we have nothing to do with those that are without. If, for any reason, they will not unite with Christ's church, then they ought not to commune in her pale. A brother told me afterwards that he had always been in theory, an open communionist, but since hearing that sermon, said he, I have no trouble on the question. It is clear to my mind still, that the church has the promise; and that there is no invisible church recognized in the New Testament. So that whatever is necessary to church membership, is necessary to christianity; i. e. to any one being recognized as a christian. *So the Bible teaches.*

In the month of December I was called to the pastorate of Bethel church, where I had been preaching for four months as a supply for Bro. J. Tol. Miller. I commenced my labors with the church the first of January, 1868.

During the fall of 1867 I preached to two of Bro. Miller's churches (Nolin and Bethel), and to White Mills as pastor. One Sunday in each month I was idle; not idle, but preached at various places where I was invited. I visited Hodgenville church, or the town, to preach on the 28th and 29th of September. On my arrival at the place I was informed that Bro. Enlow had an appointment to preach on the subject of Baptism at Buffalo, a little village about five miles northeast of Hodgenville.

I concluded not to preach at Hodgenville till four o'clock in the evening, and to go with the brother out and hear the sermon. We went and heard an able sermon. Bro. Enlow was a man of native talent and sustained his positions well. He was replying to a sermon preached there a few Sabbaths before by Dr. Lee of the Methodist church. Bro. A. J. Miller was there and two Methodist preachers—had a large congregation. Bro. Enlow asked me to make some remarks at the close of his sermon, which I did, and in these remarks made pretty much the same remarks that I did at White Mills, at the Association, viz: That there is no promise to the unbaptized. Bro. Miller sent a notice of this fact to the Western Recorder, and called the attention of the brethren to the fact. He called on me to let the brethren hear from me. I did so; saying, I confessed guilty to the charge of making the remark, if there was any guilt in the case. I said, if there is a promise to the un-

baptized, let us have the chapter and verse, and then I will take back what I have said, and say so no more. Just here the matter ended for some three months. No one said anything more about it, in the papers.

I was invited again to visit Hodgenville, Larue county, and preach for the church, which I did, and on Saturday before the third Sunday in February, 1868, I was called as pastor to take the oversight of the church, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Bro. Robt. Enlow. On the third Saturday in March, 1868, I commenced my labors with that church. Some of the brethren from South Fork church, five miles distant from Hodgenville, and not far from Buffalo, were present on Sunday, at 11 o'clock, and heard me preach. They gave me an invitation to visit their church, which I did, and preached for them on Saturday, April 11, 1868; was called as pastor for the ensuing year. I entered upon these duties at once, and preached for them on the next day, Sunday. Thus I became pastor of four churches; my membership still being at Gilead church, where I joined on my arrival in the State. I was immediately connected by these arrangements with five churches, with an aggregate of nearly a thousand members. I poured my whole soul into the work, and tried to do all the good I could. I preached from eight to twelve sermons per month, and heard my daily recitations in the college. I

worked day and night, taking but little time to rest.

There was a general stir about this time on all sides. The Protestant denominations were denouncing me because I did not regard them as christians, and because I said, on one occasion, that the present translation, i. e. King James's, was forced upon the people of England by the laws of that country, and because I said it was a partisan or sectarian translation; as much so as the Catholic translation. Things which I thought everybody knew, and hence simply stated as facts. Episcopalians translated it, and the King, a member of that church and the head of the church at that time, ordered it read in all the realm.

At this time, also, Rev. R. M. Dudley, of the Western Recorder, called on me for an explanation of the assertion that "*There is no promise in the New Testament to the unbaptized as such,*" saying the columns of the Recorder were open for me to say whatever I wished to the Baptists of Kentucky. I sat down and wrote the following article, and sent it to the office of the Recorder for publication, which was immediately published:

"NO PROMISE TO THE UNBAPTIZED AS SUCH."

"LYNNLAND INSTITUTE, March 20, 1868.

* "BRO. DUDLEY: Your suggestion for me to explain my position has been considered, and I now propose to do so. You will please accept my thanks for the interest manifested and the kind tender of your columns. The assertion, sir:

“ ‘*The New Testament contains no promise to the unbaptized as such.*’ Bro. Shackelford (then editor of the Christian Herald, Tuscumbia, Ala.) seems to think there is nothing gained by the subjoined phrase, ‘*as such.*’ A moment’s consideration will show any one that the sense of the proposition is materially changed by it. Jesus says: ‘All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.’ John vi. 37. Here is a promise; it is made to Christ’s seed, but this promise is predicated upon another: ‘*The promise made by the Father to Christ that he would give him a people on the earth.*’ Isaiah liii, 10-12. But this seed or people of Christ are all sinners, and have no promise *as such*. Christ came to save his people from their sins, but God alone knows who these are till they have been sanctified by the Spirit, and become obedient to the truth. As sinners, the people of Christ are all under condemnation. It is only when they are born again and walk in the commandments of God their Saviour that they have the promise. It is necessary for men to repent in order that they may accept of Christ as a Saviour. It is necessary for men to believe before they can become the children of God. It is necessary for them to be baptized to enter the kingdom of God on earth. It is necessary for the repenting, believing soul to become obedient to the commands of Christ, that he may claim the promise. ‘Not every one that saith

unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven.' Matt. vii, 21. The Apostle James says; 'We are not justified by faith only; that, as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead, being alone.' I understand this to be the meaning of the Apostle: Faith and works, or obedience, are so closely connected that it is impossible for the former to exist without the latter. Repentance is necessary to salvation, but does not give it. Faith is necessary, but we cannot be saved by faith only. That is to say, more is meant by faith in the New Testament than a mere belief of the proposition that Jesus is the Christ of God. Baptism is essential to a professing of, or putting on of Christ, or declaring our allegiance to him. It is necessary to a public demonstration of our faith, since it is the divinely appointed means. But baptism does not give salvation any more than a demonstration of a proposition in Euclid makes it true. But a man who does not make the demonstration of the faith, has not the promise of the New Testament: 'Ye are my friends if you do whatsoever I command you.' But the baptized are without the promise unless they go on to do whatsoever Jesus has commanded. In short, then, the New Testament contains no promise to the unfaithful or disobedient.

"A man may say he has faith, while he does not love his brother. I say no amount of faith, even

though it could remove mountains, will avail you anything, while you do not love your brother; you have not the promise, sir. I may say that I believe in Jesus, but while I am not baptized, I show that I am a rebel; hence, mine is not a faith of the New Testament; for *that* was always followed by baptism. So I am without the promise of that book. The Holy Spirit as much commands every penitent believer to be baptized as (He) did Saul, speaking through Ananias. If the penitent refuse, believe he ever so much, he is without the promise made to Paul. One thing is certain, all New Testament christians were baptized. There is no promise to those who are not christians, so there is no promise to the unbaptized *as such*. I can see no way for the man to escape who does not forgive his enemies; nor for the one who does not love his brother. No more can I see how a man can escape who refuses to be baptized.

“I hope this hurried letter will, to some extent, explain my meaning, when I make the assertion that the New Testament contains no promise to the unbaptized as such. But, since it is a negative proposition, I will hardly be expected to prove it. If any one feels inclined I will gladly answer, or try at least to answer, any objection that may be used against it.

“Yours, truly,

“G. A. COULSON.”

EDITORIAL REMARKS.

“In these times of rampant Pelagianism it is well that the brethren should pronounce distinctly the Shibboleths of Jordan. We are glad that Bro. Coulson has come out and explained the sense of his oft repeated assertion; ‘The New Testament contains no promise to the unbaptized as such.’ Being a stranger in our midst we are more apt to prick up our ears at such assertions, than if his doctrinal views were well understood. We felt assured from a short conversation we had with him in our office that, while the remark was susceptible of misconstruction, he nevertheless used it in a perfectly justifiable sense. As a test of love and fealty to Christ baptism is essential to salvation in the sense that he who professes the former and is unwilling to submit to the latter, proves by his very unwillingness that he is destitute of both love and fealty to Christ. In this sense the New Testament contains no promise to the unbaptized, or the unbaptized *as such*; I care not which. ‘Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you.’ He has commanded the penitent believer to be baptized, and now if the penitent believer despises the command of Christ, and refuses baptism, he thereby proves that he is not the friend of Christ. And every Baptist in the land is ready to say to that man the New Testament contains no promise to the unbaptized.

“R. M. DUDLEY, Editor.”

I call the attention of every reader to the fact that the foregoing article contains the doctrine which has been denounced as Heresy. And especially do I wish it to be remembered that for the doctrine contained in this article Salem Association, at the session held with Benleyville church, Meade county, Ky., a large per cent. of which was preachers, admonished Gilead church and all the churches of Salem Association, and advised Baptists everywhere to give neither countenance nor encouragement to the unscriptural doctrine of those who may thus attempt to sow the seeds of discord among us. (See Minutes Salem Association, page 3, No. 83.)

The Western Recorder and its editor, Rev. R. M. Dudley, were warmly and heartily endorsed by that body, while I was condemned as a heretic. Why was this? Was it because Eld. Dudley had recanted? Was it because he had explained? This cannot be shown. No, kind reader, it was not because he had recanted or explained. I suppose there was a reason, but I do not know what it was. You may read what I have said in the article, and then read Bro. D.'s endorsement, and judge for yourself. But you will excuse me for calling your special attention to one thought in the remarks of the editor. He says: "*As a test of love and fealty to Christ baptism is essential to salvation in the sense that he who professes the former and is unwilling to submit to the latter, proves, by his very unwillingness, that he is destitute of both love and*

fealty to Christ." Loyalty and love to Christ are to be tested by a man's *willingness* to submit to baptism. But with Elder Dudley nothing is baptism but *immersion*. But Protestants and Catholics are unwilling to submit to *immersion*. Therefore these are destitute of love and fealty to Christ. No ingenuity of reasoning can extricate him from the dilemma. Sprinkling and pouring must be baptism, or Protestants and Catholics are not christians; for the fact that they are unwilling to be immersed is universally conceded.

I ask you to remember, these remarks were made by the Editor of the Western Recorder, and that he said of them, in another number of that paper, "WHAT I HAVE WRITTEN I HAVE WRITTEN." And now, after five years have passed, I cannot tell just what to take out to make the article orthodox. It is not as clear in some places as it might be, but almost any one could get my meaning by reading the article once. It simply means that baptism is essential to a manifestation of our acceptance of Christ as our Lord and Saviour.

But the objection seems ever to have been urged against the proposition itself. There might be some excuse for the unlettered and ignorant to do such a thing. But how persons making any pretensions to an ordinary education could do such a thing I cannot tell; for while it is true that a man is bound to use words in their ordinary acceptation, it is equally true.

that he has the right to explain his own assertions or propositions, and the inexorable laws of logic require us to accept of the explanation. A man has the right even to change his assertions so that they will express his ideas. And the great law of love, i. e. charity, requires us to accept them as changed, and approve or condemn. I call your attention to the concluding article on this subject, found in the Western Recorder of May 16, 1868 :

THE CONCLUSION.

DEAR BRO. DUDLEY :

I now take up my pen to close the discussion, on my part, that has grown out of my use of the phrase, "*no promise to the unbaptized as such.*" I am now satisfied it was injudicious in me to use it ; not but what it is true, but many good brethren, as you say, have failed to understand it. When first used it was in an animated discourse. I meant to teach, as I have always taught, that those who reject or refuse baptism have no promise in the New Testament. All that has been said on the subject has not changed my mind in the least. I am satisfied my brethren do not understand me. Many that have long been familiar with me, think it strange I should be accused of Campbellism. But why should I be surprised when they do not understand you, a man with whom they have been so long acquainted ? I, myself, object to the phrase, "Baptism is essential to salvation," but Bap-

tists have so long used it that I can hardly see the propriety in objecting to its use now. In fact these verbal criticisms are not profitable for godliness. Now I say most heartily, and unequivocally, that the man who believes in Jesus with all his heart will be saved ; but I think he will also be baptized. I think the New Testament teaches that those who believed were baptized ; hence the promise is, in the New Testament, to the baptized. I do not believe there ever was a man who became a disciple of Christ, who did not first become an humble soul. Although humility may not be in any sense *essential* to salvation. I do not believe any man can go to heaven who loves his father and mother more than Christ. That is, if he continues to do this, and this is all that I ever meant by “no promise to the unbaptized *as such*.” No promise to those who continue to refuse baptism. I do not believe any man can be saved who hates his brother, for “He is a murderer, and you know no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.” Now, to love a brother, may not be essential to salvation, in the sense that we can not believe in Jesus without it ; loving a brother does not give belief, yet he who believes, in the true sense of the term, will love his brother. So he that believes in Christ with all his heart, will say, “What hinders, that I should not be baptized ?” Religion, soul-religion, heartfelt religion, will make men obedient to Christ. When a poor sinner gets such a view of the cross as I have had, he

will say, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." He will not say it makes no difference how I am baptized, or whether I am baptized at all or not. He will run after Christ, and covet obedience to his commands. "He that loveth me, he it is that keepeth my commandments." Having the heart right is everything, but to the man whose heart is right the commands are everything. "Ye are my friends if you do whatsoever I command you." When the power of reigning sin is subdued in the heart, grace reigns. and love, celestial love, is kindled there, a holy fire to consume sin. This love manifests itself in obedience to the commandments of God our Savior. "This is the love of God that ye keep his commandments." When a man is converted, and turns to the Lord, he becomes a new creature in Christ. "Old things pass away, behold all things become new." He has passed from death unto life when he believes in Jesus. But he knows this by the love he bears to the brethren. "But by this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments." Keeping the commandments does not make us love God, but, *the love of God does not make us keep his commandments.* Here our brethren seem to misapprehend us. We are contending that faith will produce its fruits. That where the love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost, there will also be found a willing soul to keep all the commandments of his

Saviour. Our great Teacher was not afraid to say that the man who "heard his words and did them would build his house upon the rock." When about to leave the world he was not afraid to say, "Go proclaim the good news to all the world, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." When the affrighted, convicted murderers of Jesus cried out, "What must we do? Peter was not afraid to answer, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Annanias was not afraid to say to the repenting Saul, "Why tarriest thou; arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Peter could say, eight souls were saved by water, which in an antitype immersion now saves us also. ("Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the requirement of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." (Bible Union translation.) But because Campbellites have exalted baptism to a saving ordinance, we must be accused of being tinctured with their views, if we talk of baptism as it is found in the New Testament.

"Oh for a faith that will not shrink,
Though pressed by every foe."

We need much of God's grace to carry us through this fiery trial. May God sustain us. Suppose I say there is no promise in the New Testament to the man who will not forgive those who trespass against him.

When I say this, will any brother write a long article contending that I have made forgiveness necessary, or essential to salvation. Suppose he trusts in Jesus Christ with all his heart, gives his life to the preaching of the gospel, gives his body to be burned, and yet will not forgive those who trespass against him, what then—must he be damned? I answer, this is a case that does not occur. Those who trust in Jesus, and love him, will forgive men their trespasses. Now there is just this in the case of baptism. Jesus has commanded it as much as he has to forgive our enemies, or love our brethren; if we refuse, we have not the promise, in the same sense in which the unforgiving have not the promise. But I am sick of explaining. I have said, “Baptism no more gives salvation than a demonstration of a proposition in Euclid makes it true,” and yet no one believes me on this point. Why not? And echo answers, why not? But I must close. I shall wait and pray till God shall take me to his rest. O, for a union of hearts and a union of hands, to go forth to the work of evangelizing the world. Let us strive for the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.

Yours in hope of the promised rest.

G. A. COULSON.

P. S. I shall be glad to see our brother “Layman” show that baptism is essential to church membership. I challenge him to the task.

G. A. C.

Now you have before you the sum of what I have written upon the subject of no promise to the unbaptized. I am willing now to submit to the decision of the Baptist brotherhood. Is there anything contrary to the teachings of the New Testament? Is there anything contrary to the articles of faith in any Baptist Church? I submit to your judgment, unbiased by what you have hitherto heard.

On the 21st of May, 1868, I met the General Association at Danville, Ky. Most of the brethren met me kindly. Bro. Robert Thurman, the prince of agents, and lover of all the rising ministry of the State, met me with more than usual kindness, and ventured to encourage me by saying that the *conclusion* which had just appeared in the Recorder was satisfactory. He would give me a little bit of advice—prefacing the same with an anecdote. “Once, said he, ‘there was a certain king who was in need of a driver for his carriage. He caused several professedly good drivers to be summoned before him, that he might ascertain some of their excellencies as coachmen.’ ‘How close, said the king to the first, ‘can you drive to a precipice and not run off.’ He answered, ‘very close, sir.’ The second said ‘he could drive within an inch of the edge.’ The third said ‘he could drive so that half the wheel would be over the precipice.’ A fourth answered, ‘very close, sir, but when I drive the king’s family I always drive as far from the precipice as possible.’” So, said Bro. Thurman,

When I say this, will any brother write a long article contending that I have made forgiveness necessary, or essential to salvation. Suppose he trusts in Jesus Christ with all his heart, gives his life to the preaching of the gospel, gives his body to be burned, and yet will not forgive those who trespass against him, what then—must he be damned? I answer, this is a case that does not occur. Those who trust in Jesus, and love him, will forgive men their trespasses. Now there is just this in the case of baptism. Jesus has commanded it as much as he has to forgive our enemies, or love our brethren; if we refuse, we have not the promise, in the same sense in which the unforgiving have not the promise. But I am sick of explaining. I have said, “Baptism no more gives salvation than a demonstration of a proposition in Euclid makes it true,” and yet no one believes me on this point. Why not? And echo answers, why not? But I must close. I shall wait and pray till God shall take me to his rest. O, for a union of hearts and a union of hands, to go forth to the work of evangelizing the world. Let us strive for the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.

Yours in hope of the promised rest.

G. A. COULSON.

P. S. I shall be glad to see our brother “Layman” show that baptism is essential to church membership. I challenge him to the task.

G. A. C.

Now you have before you the sum of what I have written upon the subject of no promise to the unbaptized. I am willing now to submit to the decision of the Baptist brotherhood. Is there anything contrary to the teachings of the New Testament? Is there anything contrary to the articles of faith in any Baptist Church? I submit to your judgment, unbiased by what you have hitherto heard.

On the 21st of May, 1868, I met the General Association at Danville, Ky. Most of the brethren met me kindly. Bro. Robert Thurman, the prince of agents, and lover of all the rising ministry of the State, met me with more than usual kindness, and ventured to encourage me by saying that the *conclusion* which had just appeared in the Recorder was satisfactory. He would give me a little bit of advice—prefacing the same with an anecdote. “Once, said he, ‘there was a certain king who was in need of a driver for his carriage. He caused several professedly good drivers to be summoned before him, that he might ascertain some of their excellencies as coachmen.’ ‘How close, said the king to the first, ‘can you drive to a precipice and not run off.’ He answered, ‘very close, sir.’ The second said ‘he could drive within an inch of the edge.’ The third said ‘he could drive so that half the wheel would be over the precipice.’ A fourth answered, ‘very close, sir, but when I drive the king’s family I always drive as far from the precipice as possible.’” So, said Bro. Thurman,

you must get as far from Campbellism as possible. I answered, this can not be done, owing to the bramble-bush on the other side. The way in which the King has commanded us to drive, is a straight and narrow way. Protestantism on one side, and Campbellism on the other. It is a close drive we must make.

During this meeting I had a private talk with Bro. Dudley. He was satisfied that we had reached a point in the discussion where it ought to stop. I agreed to this, and said all I wished was a full explanation, this I had had and felt to let the matter rest. I said to him, "*the inevitable conclusion of our logic* is 'that Pedo-Baptists are not christians.' From this he dissented and said, "The Baptists of Kentucky will not receive it." I did not say that Pedo-Baptists are not converted, but I said we can not recognize them as disciples. I said the New Testament does not so regard them. It is taken for granted in this that all christians, i. e. disciples, are baptized.

On the 28th of June, 1868, I preached at Gilead Church, having exchanged pulpits with Bro. J. Tol Miller, by request—he preaching for me at the same time at White Mills. Subject—

THE TRANSFORMATION.

"Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." 2d Cor. v. 17.

Christianity is of God. The whole plan for the

reclamation and redemption of man is divine. The soul and *body* are to be reclaimed and redeemed. Man is to be saved in the flesh. Jesus was made flesh to save us while in the flesh. In this world, in the days of our flesh, we must be saved or there is no hope for us. We are to be redeemed as men; hence the requirements—repentance, faith, baptism, good works. God operates upon the mind by his word; upon the heart by his spirit. The mind of God is set forth in his word, addressed to our minds. His spirit moves our hearts by his divine energy, to the acceptance of the Son as our Savior. We are called of God by his word, but by his spirit we are taught of God. In this we receive the high and heavenly calling which always brings us to Christ. So we preach Christ. “Unto the Jews a stumbling-block; to the Greeks foolishness, but unto the *called*, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God.”

I. CONVERSION—QUICKENING—REGENERATION—BORN AGAIN.

God, by his Word, preached or read, shows us the sinfulness of our nature—by his Spirit makes us *feel* that we are sinners. There is an inward consciousness as well as an outward recognition of the lost condition. The eyes of our understanding are opened—the sensibility of our nature is moved—we see ourselves as sinners—we recognize the awful fact that we are condemned—lost. God does this

work for us, by the Spirit, through his word ; it is all the work of God. It is independent of us. He, of His own sovereign will, quickens us, converting the soul, begetting in us the seed of life eternal. Our minds are enlightened, our hearts softened, our affections changed. We see that sin is an evil—that it is *exceeding sinful*.” We desire a Saviour—we long to be free from sin. God has made us to see ourselves in the wrong and him in the right. There are no commands for us to convert, or quicken or regenerate ourselves. This is the work of God. Therefore, we are not concerned in the work, only so far as we are to receive the benefits. We are not consulted about it. Hence we should not trouble ourselves as to how it is done.

II. REPENTANCE.

Being made to see and feel ourselves as sinners in the sight of God—recognizing God as a holy, just, and good being, who has created us for our good and his glory; feeling that He has done all things well, giving us only good continually, and that we have been unthankful. There is a godly sorrow in our hearts, which leads to repentance, not to be repented of. The sorrow is not the repentance, but the cause of it. We are led by these views of the goodness of God to sorrow after a goodly sort, and hence to repent—to change from our wicked course and turn to God.

But God is angry with us, for we have offended him. He has said, "The soul that sinneth it shall die;" filled with sin, covered with iniquity, and dare not approach him. How well, my brethren, do I remember when I felt the guilt and condemnation upon me. I had a tender conscience and desired to sin no more; but Oh! the past, the bitter past! I would have given ten thousand worlds could I have had all this guilt and stain of sin washed away. I said, in the language of Job, "How shall a man be just with God?" I believe it is so with all those whom God converts. So then, seeing the exceeding sinfulness of sin, we turn from it and loathe it as we would the carcass by the road side; and being taught of God, we turn to him. Hence Paul preached repentance toward God. This is right; I mean there is a fitness in it. It is God we have offended, hence we turn from sin and turn unto Him. This is evangelical or Bible repentance, and that which does not accomplish this is a repentance that will do us no good; for all things must be made new. We must hate the things we once loved, and love the things we once hated. But the sorrowing, repenting sinner must have the great questions answered: "How can a man be just with God?" "*What must I do to be saved?*" Above is an angry God; beneath is a yawning hell. I am lost, how can I be saved?"

III. FAITH

“Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.” Hence, in the place where the night seems to be the darkest, and God the farthest from us, Lo! he comes the nearest. In the blessed gospel Jesus is presented to us as the Saviour. We are pointed to the cross as the center of all our hopes. He bears our sins in his own body on the tree. He is the Lamb of God that taketh away our sins. On the bloody tree behold him, bathed in sweat and tears. It is God’s own sacrifice. He will not deny himself. See in the cross the manifestation of God’s hatred to sin; He will punish sin. Christ has assumed the place of the sinner; he must therefore suffer in his stead. But behold how much God loves us. My soul rejoices while I speak—God so loved us as to give his son to die for us. God must delight to save or he would not have made such a sacrifice. With trembling and delight, O! sinners, draw near; look at Jesus on the cross. He smiles in his love—he will set you free. Well do I remember when first I said, I will draw near, I will trust him for his grace. This is faith, to take God at his word and venture on Christ for salvation. O what a plan, what a blessed plan! God has made a sacrifice of his own; we will accept of this, and then will he who has been angry with us, become our eternal friend. But this Saviour is Jesus the Christ as revealed in the Bible. This same Jesus who died for our sins and

was buried, then raised for our justification; this same Jesus has God raised up and exalted, so that he has a name above every name—he has become both Lord and Christ. At his name every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess him Lord over all to the glory of God the Father. Jesus must be received, then, as the Great High Priest of God, who makes the offering once in the end of the world for sin. As the Great Prophet of God to teach us; of whom Moses spake, saying, “And it shall come to pass that the Lord your God shall raise up a prophet unto himself like unto me, him shall ye hear in all things, and it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hear the prophet shall be cut off from his people.” We must receive him as the exalted King in Zion, who is God over all, blessed forevermore. We must have no sacrifice but his. All our righteousness must be counted as filthy rags. We must be able to say, “Nothing in my hands I bring, simply to the cross I cling.” We must have no other Priest; no mortal man must come in between us and God; none must be substituted for Christ. And, above all, we can have no King but Him. God has determined that “All shall honor the Son as they honor the Father. No one, then, can be truly said to have accepted of Christ, or to have the faith of the New Testament, who does not accept of him in his three offices—Prophet, Priest, and King. But such a faith, my brethren, brings us to submit to the authority of Christ.

Having found a solution to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" and having found Christ as the Saviour, there is joy unspeakable and full of glory. O! how like Mary, we would sit at the feet of Jesus and learn of him. Or, like Paul, we would say, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?"

IV. BAPTISM.

This is the first requirement of the penitent believer. The voice of the Holy Spirit to such an one is, "Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Jesus, our Saviour, in the great commission says, "Go preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." When Peter, on the day of Pentecost, stood up with the eleven and declared to the Jews that this Jesus whom they had crucified—God had made both Lord and Christ. They believing this fact said, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" Peter said unto them, "Repent, every one of you, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." And it is recorded for our benefit that "As many as gladly received his word were baptized." When Phillip preached Jesus unto the people of Samaria, those that believed were baptized, both men and women. Paul found twelve disciples at Ephesus. He asked them if they had received the Holy Spirit since they believed. They answered, "We have not so much as heard if there

be a Holy Spirit." Paul said, "Unto what, then, were ye baptized?" plainly implying, my brethren, that he did not expect to find a disciple of Christ that was not baptized. Yea, more than this, that such a thing was not known among the disciples in the days of the apostles. To this idea also correspond the teachings in all the epistles to the churches. All christians had been baptized.

My brethren you will excuse me for referring to myself. I know how it was with me in the day of my espousal to Christ. That moment I could say in my heart, "*Jesus is my Saviour.*" I felt it to be my duty to obey him. I never thought of anything like salvation by baptism. I felt that Christ had saved me, and it was my duty to manifest that fact to the world. My duty to be baptized was as plain as it could be. I went forward and obeyed, feeling that when baptized I was numbered among the disciples of Christ. I never have been able to see how a truly converted man or woman, with the New Testament to read, could do anything less. I know not how it can be to this day, and I have my fears that those who do not feel it to be their duty to be baptized, have not been converted to God; have not truly accepted of Jesus as the Saviour. One thing is certain, in the days of the apostles all those made disciples were immediately baptized. Hence there is no discipleship known in the New Testament that did not result in baptism. There is then no scripture for unbaptized

disciples. But the promises are to the disciples ; to the church, the bride of Christ, which is composed of baptized disciples. Notice, we are not made disciples by baptism, but we are baptized because we are disciples.

Brethren, there is an infinite difference between the idea of being justified by good works, i. e. because of them, and the idea of being justified by faith ; yet we know of no such thing as being justified by faith, and no good works following. The faith that saves us is a faith that sweetly works by love, and purifies the heart and leads to good works. This I have found in all the teachings of my brethren everywhere. Now can I be said to make baptism essential to salvation because I maintain that as a legitimate consequence it always followed faith ? By no means. I may be mistaken as to this fact. I arrive at the conclusion by what is known in logic, "*The law of induction.*" In all the cases mentioned in the New Testament, faith is immediately followed by baptism. If the New Testament is to be the guide, we can affirm that there are no unbaptized disciples, i. e. remaining unbaptized. That is, all who were made disciples were immediately baptized. It is admitted that this is true of New Testament christians, but it is claimed that it is not so now. All that can be said of my position—no discipleship that does not result in baptism, is that it is a different opinion from what my brethren entertain. It can not be said to be con-

trary to scripture or the articles of faith, on which our churches are agreed. But all things are made new, so we pass from this to

V. GOOD WORKS.

The apostle James says, "Faith without works is dead, being alone." So the whole tenor of the New Testament—make the tree good and the fruit will be good. The sweet fountain will send forth sweet water. Ye are my friends if "Ye do whatsoever I command you." "Not every one that saith unto me Lord! Lord! shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." Brethren, "If any man be in Christ he is a *new* creature; old things have passed away, behold *all things* are become new." What is our christianity if it does not makes us different from what we were in transgression? The proposition is to some, to save from sin. This is done in the way we have described. God, the Holy Spirit, takes the converted soul and gently leads it along by ways it has not known, and by paths it has not seen. The promise is, and "He shall guide you into all truth." They that are born of the spirit are led by the spirit. Romanism and Protestantism have many things in common; more, I think, than christianity and Protestantism. If so, these are the servants of Rome. But even Pedeo-baptists admit that those who reject baptism are not disciples—christians. Here is

Mr. Thomas O. Summers' work on baptism. He says, "It is essential to christianity, as it was instituted by the author and finisher of our faith. " "It is necessary to salvation, as no one can be saved who neglects a known duty." Summers on **Baptism**, page 14. Here the author takes strong ground. The only remaining question is, "Is baptism a '*known duty*' to Protestants?" They have an open Bible, and their learning and talent will compare favorably with ours. Now, brethren, what say you? Can we know what baptism is? I feel assured you all answer, yes. But prejudice and early education prevents the millions of Catholics and Protestants from seeing it. Is not this reasoning fatal to the cause of truth? You admit the requirement to be baptized is clearly set forth in the New Testament. Now if prejudice and early education prevents them from seeing the truth, *how do you know that it is not education and prejudice that causes you to think as you do?!!* If from these causes they *can not see*, how do you know that you see? Do you not see at once that such a process of reasoning is fatal to your cause? They say you are blind. You say they are blind. Which is the higher authority? **Are** we not all men, and liable to be mistaken? I answer, yes. But we that are in Christ Jesus are new creatures. We are led by the Spirit into all truth. So we must think. But I must close, let us gather again around the cross of Christ. Oh, how pleasant

to gather there! Permit me to say that I am satisfied that all those who put their trust in Christ, and desire to do his will, and heartily turn from their sins, will be among the saved, i. e. the redeemed, in the day of the Lord Jesus. While I urge the importance of examining ourselves to see if we be in the faith, I judge no man. Christ must judge us all; to him we must render the account; before him we stand or fall. But he has taught us that it is by our deeds we must know one another. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Christ is a precious Saviour, and I want you all to have him as *your* Saviour. May God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit so grant it Amen.

I can never forget how that large audience looked when I closed this sermon. The sermon had touched the hearts of the people. Many went to their homes to thank God for the blessed gospel. Many were there who gave vent to their feelings in eyes streaming with tears, and countenances beaming with joy. It was said by some to be "The best sermon ever preached in that house." I was not made vain by this. I trembled at my responsibility, and rejoiced that God, through me, had spoken to the people, and that he had permitted me to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ. This was the last invitation Bro. Miller ever gave me to preach. A Reformed brother said to a brother of mine, after the sermon, "I do not know whether I am a Baptist or a Reformer, but I am whatever your brother is." I felt to say, thank

God for that! for I knew I had not preached the doctrine of the Bethany Reformer, that day. My own brethren said it was all right. It was the Bible. So I thanked God and took courage.

When I ceased to preach for Nolin Church as Bro. Miller's supply, I left rather abruptly, expecting to preach again the next monthly meeting. As I did not, many of the brethren urged me to come and preach for them again. So I told them they might make an appointment for me on Sunday 4 o'clock P. M., July 19, 1868. On Saturday previous at the church meeting some one asked Bro. J. Tol. Miller to make the announcement. He objected to my preaching in the house, saying, that I taught heresy. Some of the brethren reminded him of the fact that he and I were members of the same church, and that he ought not to make such charges against me in public, till he had made the charge before his own church. And others wished to know if the brethren did not have a right to invite a baptist minister to preach in their house of worship, when not occupied. Bro. Miller then withdrew his objection, saying, "I did not know that Bro. Coulson had been invited." So on Sunday evening at 4½ o'clock I preached the following sermon to a crowded house—Bro. Robt. Thurman being present. I had met him the Friday or Saturday before this, and had a short talk with him at Bro. Miller's. This was his first time to hear me preach.

HOW WE BECOME CHRISTIANS.

ACTS. XXVI: 28.—“*Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.*”

INTRODUCTION,

Christian is a name that was given to the disciples of Christ in the beginning of the Gospel dispensation. It was given as a name of reproach by their enemies. It is never used in a good sense in the New Testament, that is, as a name given by the Holy Spirit; and is used only three times in the whole book. It is now used to denote persons who are not Jews, Pagans, or Mohomedans. In a stricter sense it is used to denote those, who in some way profess Christ as a Savior. In the New Testament it is used to denote a disciple of Christ. It is in this sense we use the term at this time. Hence the object of the present hour is to make known to you *how we become* disciples of Christ. To the task then we would address ourselves with all the ardor the subject demands.

HOW DO WE BECOME DISCIPLES OF CHRIST?

We need only announce to this audience the fact *that all men are sinners*, and therefore not the followers of Christ—until they are changed; “for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.” “For if Christ died for all, then were *all*

dead." When search was made for the good, by the omnific eye it was found that there was *none* good, no not one. "All like sheep had gone astray." The Divine record is, "There is none good, *no not one*."

I. We must be quickened or made alive; for it is manifest from the nature of the case that the dead can not be disciples—because this implies a learner, a follower, sinners, dead in trespasses and in sins can not be the disciples of Christ. All christians therefore have been quickened, made alive from the dead. This quickening or making alive from the death of sin is the work of God in the person of the Holy Spirit. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Rom. VIII. 2. "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and in sins." But God who is rich in mercy for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, has quickened us together with Christ. Eph. II. 1, 4, 5. "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." Col. II. 13. Persons thus made alive, see their lost condition. They behold a beauty in holiness—even the holiness of God. Hence they turn from dead works or works of death to seek and to serve the living God. They cry out: "O, that I knew where I might find

him!" or, "How shall a man be just with God?" or, "What must I do to be saved?" They believe in God and inquire the way of life. They come to Him, 'believing that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.' Repentance from dead works and belief in the goodness of God are two of the essentials or first principles of Christianity. No one can become a christian without these, and yet they do not make a man a christian. More than this is necessary to complete the work.

II. We must believe what God has taught concerning his Son who is Jesus the Christ. We must recognize this Jesus as *our* Savior. We must trust in him for our salvation, we must rely wholly upon him, and take him to be our Prophet, Priest, and King. Faith in Christ must be distinguished from belief in God. Yet it would seem that all those who truly believe in God do also trust in Christ and therefore are saved. But it should never be forgotten that faith or trust in Jesus as the Christ is necessary to our becoming *christians*. For to be a christian we must be a follower of Christ; but this we cannot be till we regard him as the Lord from heaven. If we truly believe on *him*, then must we become his followers. If any man should simply hear the words of Jesus and fail to do them, he would build his house upon the sand. Trusting in Christ saves us, because it makes us learn of

him and follow him. God sees the heart, he knows the thoughts, but man cannot do this. So then while it is in theory true that every believer, that moment he believes is saved from sin and death. Yet, to us practically he is not a disciple till he takes up his cross and becomes a follower of Christ. In heart he is a disciple; this is between himself and his God, *we* will know the fact when he becomes a follower of Christ.

III. Baptism is the outward act by which we are to manifest our willingness to follow Christ. He has placed it thus by his command, and by his example. Before he entered upon his public ministry he himself goes down into the water, is buried in baptism. Shadowing forth the nature of his own death. Manifesting his willingness to become subject to the Father's requirements. It seems to us that a man who is made a disciple will follow the great teacher where he has gone. And especially since it is His great command. "Go disciple the nations—baptizing them." Baptism and faith are so connected that the former always follows the latter immediately in the New Testament. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "As many as gladly received his word were baptized." "And believing, they were baptized, both men and women." "And when they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." The first duty of the believer is to be baptized in water to

manifest his acceptance of Christ as the Son of God. *In the New Testament all those who believed in Christ accepted of him as their Leader and Teacher and were immediately baptized into his name.*

There cannot be a single exception found. It ought to be the same now. As baptism is appointed for the public recognition of the fact that we have died to sin, and that we are now to live for God, and that we take Christ to be our Great Captain-General; it would seem fit that no one should be regarded as his disciple who does not follow him in this requirement. He who fully and truly renounces all allegiance to the world, will certainly manifest his allegiance to Christ in the appointed way. So at least it seems to me. I say, therefore, *no one should be regarded as a christian, (disciple) who does not put on Christ in baptism.* This opinion, however, is regarded by some of my brethren as a "*dangerous heresy.*" I submit then a few quotations from eminent authors to show that I am not by myself in holding these views. George Hill, an eminent divine of the Scotch Church, of the school of Calvin and Knox, a Pedo-Baptist, says, in his "*Lectures on Divinity,*" page 663: "Although, we account it a presumptuous sin to despise the seal, baptism, yet, as the remission of sins rests upon the promise of God in Christ, we do not account the seal so indispensably

necessary, as to render the promise void to those who have not the *means* of receiving baptism according to the original institution." It is clear that Mr. Hill regarded those who refused baptism as guilty of presumptuous sin, and the only exception he makes is in the case of those who have not the means or opportunity to be baptized. Those who refused or neglected baptism because of an indifference to the ordinance, he could not have regarded as disciples of Christ.

"It (baptism) is essential to christianity, as it was instituted by the Author and Finisher of our faith. It is a saving ordinance, as is every thing also that pertains to the gospel of our salvation.

It is necessary to salvation, as no one can be saved who neglects a known duty; but it is not so necessary but that a man may be saved without it, if nothing but invincible ignorance or insuperable obstacles occasion the neglect." Summers on baptism. pp. 14. 15.

Thus writes Thomas O. Summers, editor of the *Christian Advocate*, the leading organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. So then if the baptist view is right, that immersion alone is baptism, and this is a known duty, Methodists and all those who sprinkle and pour for baptism are not christians and will not be saved, Mr. Summers himself being judge. Baptism is a known duty and all Pede-Baptists neglect it, not only so,

but many of them reject it, others repudiate it altogether, and I am accused of heresy, because I believe that these are not the followers of Christ.

“The man who received the proclamation of the gospel with susceptible mind, who professed faith in Christ, who was penetrated with the new principles of the higher life, brought by the Savior of mankind, was for that reason baptized.” Olshausen’s Commentary on the New Testament; Acts II. 37. 41. “We go down into the water full of sin and pollution, but come up again, to bring forth fruit, having in our hearts the fear and hope which is in Jesus.” Barnabas, Paul’s Companion, as quoted by Orchard in his History of Baptists, page 13.

“The principle design in the ordinance seems to be a solemn, public, and practicable profession of christianity.” Encyclopedia Religious Knowledge p. 186.

They (The Baptist,) believe it essential to salvation in the same sense in which obedience to any other command is essential.” Brown in *ib.* p 181.

“So many of us as have by baptism become disciples of Christ.” Macknight’s Commentary on Rom. VI. 3. “To be baptised into the name of any person or into any person, is solemnly, as Locke says, to enter oneself a disciple of him into whose name he is baptized. *ib.* I. Cor I. 13.

“The person baptized abjures the world, enters into covenant with God.” Wayland. Prin. and Prac. of Bap.

“And whosoever does not bear his cross, and come after me cannot be my disciple.” New Testament. Luke XIV 27.

“So likewise whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath cannot be my disciple.” 33d verse.

No discipleship without following Christ. That is to say, when a man is made a disciple he becomes a follower of Christ. But to follow Christ our Lord fully we must go with him down into the water. “Buried with him in baptism.” You may take the question as you please; to follow Christ is necessary to discipleship. To be a christian and to be a disciple is one and the same thing.

IV. THE RECEPTION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

As it is necessary for God the Holy Spirit to quicken us, when dead in trespasses and sins, so also is it necessary for us to have Him abide with us forever. He must sanctify us, lead us into all truth, and comfort us in distress. This is a fundamental principle of christianity. He who denies the power and agency of the Holy Spirit excludes God from the world, and rejects the only hope of his salvation. The belief in, and the

reception of the Spirit is necessary to christianity, in the sense that he who rejects Him, rejects God, and therefore cannot be a christian. He is the Shekinah of the christian church. He must reprove the world of sin, quicken dead sinners to life, comfort and console the people of God.

REMARKS.

(1) It is said of me: "You have departed from the Baptist *Confession of Faith*." This I simply deny, and call for the proof. When it shall be made to so appear I will confess my error or leave their ranks.

(2) It is said: "Your course will cause division among Baptists." I could wish it otherwise; but suppose it does, can I teach otherwise than what God has taught in his word. Are not those to blame who make the division? have not they the greater sin? I cannot be regarded as an enemy because I tell the truth.

(3) It is said: "You will bring trouble upon yourself." Suppose I do. Must a minister not preach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing else but the truth, if the heavens fall? Must I, as a minister of Christ not be willing to endure hardships? I am appealed to for the sake of my family. God will take care of these. If he does not, I cannot. If I, with them, am called upon to suffer for preaching the truth, shall we not do it.

(4) It is said: "You attach too much importance to baptism." I do not see how this can be; when I am only urging christians to be baptized. I am simply speaking of a christian duty as Christ's requirement. He must have attached much importance to the duty, seeing He has placed it along with repentance and faith. I would not exalt it only in its place. It is a christian's ordinance, and none but christians are entitled to it. So long as I place it beyond regeneration, faith, and repentance, I do not think it can prove a snare. If all christians accept of it, we will in some measure be like primitive christians. It will do us all good to continually examine ourselves to see if we be in the faith. This is all I urge.

(5) It is said: "You wish to teach Kentucky Baptist Ministers how to preach." This is not the case; I have no such vanity. I will be glad if they will permit me to do my own preaching in peace. I will certainly be willing for them to do theirs. To God we must all give account, not to man.

(6) I am asked to wait till I am older to be setting forth new doctrines. I am not aware that age has anything to do with preaching. Every preacher ought to try to preach just what God has taught, and try to bring out of the Inspired Word truths, both *new* and *old*. Baptists have found it necessary to watch very closely the teaching of the Word, to keep from being carried off by principles

and practices of others. Andrew Fuller was an "*Innovator*." He, with a few others, started the great missionary enterprise which is now receiving the attention of Baptists everywhere. This was regarded as an innovation in its incipency. The Missionary Spirit had to a considerable extent died out at that time. Many good Baptists for want of faith in the promise of God, thought the enterprise wholly chimerical. But now it is the glory of our people. Some were separated from us, because of this glorious work; but what of this, the work goes bravely on, and God is helping the work yet more and more. It is claimed by many, that J. M. Pendleton, one of the best theologians in our country, was an Innovator when he wrote the "*Old Landmark Reset*," a few years ago. But whenever an appeal is made to the Bible and the Bible alone, his principles stand forth triumphant. By a bold stand upon these principles set forth in that little work, the South has been almost entirely free from the evil effects of open communion. Yet several churches and associations were rent asunder by this at first; but the principles have triumphed with the people.

(7) The Bible and the *Bible alone* is the only rule of faith and practice for Baptists. To this every question must be brought that it may be tested. Upon this must every teaching rest or fall to the ground. *If this be not the case, then I*

am not a baptist, never have been, and never will be. I know I am honest, show me where my teachings are contrary to Scripture, and I will change instantly.

LASTLY—A WORD TO PEDO-BAPTISTS.

If you are desirous to know the truth you will not think less of me because I urge upon you the necessity of obeying Christ in all things. To my mind it is clear that the Scripture requires a personal obedience in the action of baptism, and immersion as that action. In this I am honest, as I could hope you are in your refusal to be immersed. But I have no standard to go by but the Bible. It says : The Holy Spirit will lead us into all truth. It declares that all Christ's disciples follow him. I am certain you do not do this, hence I urge you to change, and take up the cross. I surely do not love you the less because I want your souls to be saved. If I did not love you, I would say go on in your own way, it is no consequence to me. I can gain nothing in this world by urging my position, but have much to lose. Will you not be kind enough to look at the question in the light of personal responsibility. I am responsible to God. I have shown you that your learned men take the same view of the rejection of baptism as I do. I might multiply quotations sufficient to fill a book, of the same nature as those given above.

I can safely state that there is not a religious denomination upon the face of the earth, that receives baptism as a christian rite, that its leading lights do not hold substantially to the views that I do, viz: That those who refuse, reject or neglect baptism, are not the disciples of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. The difference between us is not about the importance of baptism, but as to what is baptism. As to what baptism is, I and my baptist brethren are agreed. It is the immersion of a penitent believer by a proper administrator, in water, upon a profession of his faith in Christ as his Savior. Hence, we baptize none but professed christians. Our strength as a denomination has ever been in this, *a converted church*. I differ from some of my brethren in this. I think all the disciples of Christ are so enlightened by the Holy Spirit as to understand their duty, and that they will not live in neglect of baptism, but submit to it. My brethren (*some of them*,) think not.

And now, to one and all, whatever may be the consequences in the future from my proclaiming these views, I can only pray the Lord to direct all for his glory and our good, and if I must suffer pain and scorn, shame and poverty; I can only say, 'the will of the Lord be done.' Others who have gone before me have suffered the loss of all things for Christ, shall not I? And can I say more or less than God has taught. I ask an interest in the

prayers of all the lovers of our Lord Jesus Christ. May God hasten the day when all shall see alike. And while we do not, let us strive to know and do what God has commanded. He has said : "He that heareth these saying of mine, and doeth them, shall be as a man building his house upon a rock ; but he that heareth and doeth not shall be as a foolish man building on the sand." The truth in love is our motto to the end. AMEN.

I asked Bro. Robert Thurman to conclude. He arose in his usual placid manner, and began to speak of the sermon, and to say what I was not. He said I was not a Catholic, that I was not a Protestant, that I was not a Campbellite ; and he hardly thought I was a Baptist. He said he was sure I had done Dr. Wayland an injustice in quoting him as supporting my views. He said that Dr. Wayland had a son-in-law who was a minister in the Episcopal Church, and that he knew the Dr. would not refuse to invite him into his church or pulpit, and that of course he recognized him as a disciple. After leading in prayer—he said he would, if invited, preach in the same church, on the same subject, on the following Thursday week. He was invited to preach in the same church. We were then dismissed. I went from here to White Mills, in Hardin County, to hold a protracted meeting. Bro. I. W. Bruner, and Bro. Thurman, both preached for me during the meeting. I con-

tinued at White Mills only four days; Bro. Bruner preached twice, Bro. Thurman twice, and Bro. James Cundiff once. I baptized two at the close of the meeting. I went from here to Nolin Church to hear Bro. Thurman's sermon. He changed from his purpose as announced and preached on the following propositions. 1. *There are promises to the unbaptized.* 2. *There are disciples who are not baptized.*

To much of what Bro. Therman said in his sermon I gave my hearty assent. But there were a few things from which I differed. He made a proposition at the close of his sermon for all those who would pray for the peace of Zion, the cause of missions, and could *endorse* his sermon, to come and give him the hand. I asked him to excuse me on the endorsement question, where we differed, and then I could give the hand. He agreed to do this, and almost the whole congregation came up, Pedo-Baptists among the first, especially a Methodist preacher.

I could have made a point on this. It was said of me, "The Reformers endorse your preaching, therefore you are a Campbellite." I said, the same might be said then of Bro. Thurman—the Pedo-Baptists endorse *your* preaching; therefore, you are a Pedo-Baptist. But I knew this was not just, hence I would not use it. As we all have many points in common, a sermon might be preached, and it might be a scriptural sermon, and yet heartily endorsed by ten dif-

ferent denominations. But there was a mistake upon the part of my brethren. The Reformers never did endorse my teachings, as a whole. To many things which I taught, they agreed; but there were always things about which we differed in so much that I never could consistently become a Reformer. I have no hesitancy in saying, that if this had been the case I would have joined them. But I can truthfully say that I never had any such thought. I know many of my brethren labored under the delusion that I was going to do this, and so they expressed their opinions to others, who were strangers to me, greatly to my injury.

Several days after Bro. Thurman's sermon had been preached I learned that many persons were claiming that I agreed with him, and that I had given up my position. His admirers claimed a decided victory, and said I had been completely routed.

In compliance with the wishes of many friends I agreed to reply to his sermon, that I might bring out the points of difference, and show more clearly what my position was. I so advertised in the Western Recorder, for the 5th Sunday in August.

In the meantime I continued to preach. I held a meeting of days at Bethel Church, commencing the 1st of August and closing the 6th. Baptized one; the church much revived. Also a meeting at South Fork church, in Larue county, commencing the 8th of August and closing the 17th; five received by experience and baptism.

Thus ended my first year in Kentucky; truly a year of labor and toil. I could wish my labors had been as prosperous as they were arduous; but I had a conscious peace within, which sustained me and made me feel that my labors would not be in vain in the Lord. I believed that the Lord would bring good out of these things. "All things work together for good to those that love God; to those who are called according to his purpose." I will willingly abide the decision of the Judge of all the earth as to my love and fidelity to the cause of truth.

CHAPTER III.

SECOND YEAR IN KENTUCKY.

We enter now upon the history of the second year, one of the most stormy that I ever had. But you cannot judge of this by what I shall record, for I cannot write the things as they occurred; but I will give you some idea of how things passed off.

On Saturday, the 29th of August, 1868, I moved my family to Hodgenville, Larue county. On Sunday following I preached in reply to Bro. Robt. S. Thurman's sermon, in which he affirmed that "*There are promises to the unbaptized as such,*" and that "*There are disciples who have never been baptized.*" This sermon was delivered in the presence of one among the largest congregations ever gathered at Nolin church, which is four miles southwest of Hodg-

enville. Some ten or fifteen churches were represented in the congregation. After reading a portion of Scripture, singing and prayer, I read my two articles from the Recorder on the assertion that there is no promise to the unbaptized as such. And "*No discipleship without baptism.*" After which I read the following sermon to as attentive an audience as ever listened to any man.

"THERE ARE PROMISES TO THE UNBAPTIZED AS SUCH."

This is the affirmative of a negative proposition of mine, which was explained in the Western Recorder. It was explained to mean—"No promise to those who neglect or refuse to be baptized." That is, to those who are not *now* and *never* intend to be baptized. All will remember that this was a mere assertion of mine, used in the midst of an animated discussion. I was asked by Bro. Dudley to explain the assertion. I did so, and he endorsed the explanation most heartily. It is a recognized law in logic that a man has the right to explain his own proposition when it is the least ambiguous. The universal ruling then is, that his opponents must take the proposition as explained. Much more then will a man be allowed to explain an assertion made in the midst of an animated discussion. And he who joins issue with his neighbor upon the assertion or proposition is bound by all the laws of honor and logic to take the explanation. Here is where, as I said, Bro. Thurman

miserably misrepresented me. I did *not* say he *intentionally* misrepresented me—I did not say he *wickedly* did it. I simply meant to say it was a very *glaring* misrepresentation.

He made this affirmative proposition as a contradiction to mine. He ought, then, to have shown that there are promises to those who, through life, neglect or reject baptism. This he did not do, as I will be abundantly able to show. He began by saying, “I will show that there are promises to the unbaptized.” This was not necessary, as I had set forth in my explanation of the assertion that there are, in the sense that God promises blessings upon hypothetical obedience. But you all know that the real issue between me and my brethren is—“Is there a promise of salvation to those who reject, neglect, or refuse to the end of life to be baptized?” This I have stated, time and again. I so stated it to Bro. Thurman before he preached his sermon. I will not, therefore, be drawn off by any side issue. “Does the New Testament contain a promise of salvation to any one who lives and dies unbaptized?” I maintain that it does not. If this is not the real question, our *Pedo-Baptist* friends did not understand him; for they greatly rejoiced on that occasion, as if they had gained a triumph. I grant you that he did not make his propositions very clear, but he certainly left the impression upon the minds of the congregation that *Pedo-Baptists, though unbaptized, have the promise of*

salvation. They are supposed, of course, to live and die in the delusion that they have been baptized. Then let us go to the law; for we must not speak more nor less than what this shall say. Remember, if the New Testament contains promises to those who are not now and never intend to be baptized, he must show it.-

I do not maintain that there is no promise *before* baptism. I have said no such thing. I have said there is a promise to every true believer in Christ that moment he believes. So when Brother Thurman was trying to show that there are promises *before* baptism, he was fighting against a man of straw, which he himself had set up. His first argument set forth in proof of his proposition is the case of the Phillippian jailor. Acts xvi. 25-35.

“And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises unto God; and the prisoners heard them. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one’s hands were loosed. And the keeper of the prison awaking out of his sleep, and seeing the prison doors open, drew out his sword and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had fled, but Paul cried with a loud voice, saying do thyself no harm, for we are all here. Then he called for a light and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out and said, sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, believe

on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his household, straightway. And when he had brought them into his house he set meat before them and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house.”

Suppose we take the position with Bro. Thurman, that the 31st verse contains the promise, and all the conditions, and that if he believed he would be saved. We can take the same verse and show that his belief would save his family. Paul said, “Believe, and thou shalt be saved.” You say this is all that is necessary. We answer, he said as much for his family. Hence a man can save himself and family by believing. You answer, no; the members of the family must believe also. But this is not found in Paul’s answer in this verse, and if you propose to make an addition, I will be at liberty to do the same. I may find that the jailor must do more than believe. But my position is, that if he truly believes on Jesus as his Saviour, and trusts him for salvation he is saved—safe now and safe forever. But I maintain that he will do more than believe. If he be truly converted he will obey the Saviour. Salvation means deliverance from sin. Jesus came to save his people from their sins. A man to be saved must be free from sin. He then will cease from sin, which is a transgression of the law,

and he will *learn* to do well; that is, to keep the commands of Christ. By consulting the 33d verse you will see that Paul taught the jailor to be baptized. And you will see that this duty is included in the teachings of the Lord Jesus. For they spake unto him the words of the Lord, and he and all his house are obedient to the heavenly requirements, so that the jailor and his household are immediately baptized. They then rejoiced, believing in God. Now I ask, who can fail to see the importance of baptism, since it is so closely connected with faith and salvation? Will you pause a moment and ask yourself the question, why did the Holy Spirit leave on record the fact that these persons were immediately baptized? So you see that in this place the promise of salvation is to the baptized. They were all baptized. Salvation came with faith or by faith—baptism follows faith. These are not of the number who are not now and never intend to be baptized. Bro. Thurman took the wrong company as witnesses. These are all on my side of the question. These persons, no doubt, were taught by the apostle that faith, baptism, and good works were all required of them. So they understood the blessed gospel of the Son of God, for in this the grace of God has appeared to all men, teaching us to deny ungodliness and worldly lust, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world. So the Saviour said, "If ye continue in my word then are ye my disciples indeed." John viii.

31. We must take the whole teachings of Christ, or we can not be in truth his disciples. But enough on this point. It is very clear that this is not a case of promise to the unbaptized *as such*.

II. PAUL'S CONVERSION. ACTS IX 1-18.

Bro. Thurman claimed that in this is found the promise to the unbaptized. The Lord said unto Paul, "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou shalt do." He said, here is a promise to the apostle Paul that it should be told him what he should do. But, my brethren, you can see that this is a mere quibble. It could hardly be dignified with the title of *promise*. Now I would call your attention to the fact that the first thing Paul is told to do by Ananias, is *to be baptized*. "Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Our good brother was certainly hard pressed for an argument when he took this one. What! Take Paul as an illustration of the fact that there are promises to the unbaptized? How strange! Bro. Thurman, like a great many of my opponents, had the idea in his own mind that I was teaching that there is no promise to any man until baptized. Hence no salvation without baptism. While in truth I am contending that the saved will be baptized; that Christ's people will follow him. If it could have been shown that Paul was not baptized at all, then this would have been a case in point. But Paul hav-

ing been baptized, spoils the argument ; it does not sustain his proposition, so we will pass from this.

III. He next read the 17th verse of the 22d chapter of Revelations.

“ And the spirit and the bride say come, and let him that heareth say come, and let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely.”

Here is an invitation to Christ's people to come and partake freely of the water of life. But where the promise is to the unbaptized, I am unable to see. The more I examine Bro. Thurman's proof texts, the more I am convinced of the weakness of his course. I am satisfied he wholly misunderstands my views upon the subject ; and the worst of it is, he does not seem to be anxious to be set right. There was no cause for his attack upon me if he had taken the pains to read my article, and if he will do this even now, he may see how easy a matter it would have been for us to have agreed. This scripture contains no proof that the unbaptized are to take of the water of life. My position is, that he who takes of Christ will take his commands.

IV. He then read from John vi. 37. “ All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.”

Here is a blessed promise to those who come to Christ. But can it be shown that a man will come to Christ and refuse to follow him in baptism? The

disciples of John, the Baptist, said of Jesus, "Behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." Let it be shown that any one ever came to Christ and refused to be baptized, and there will be some show of argument. But while it is true that Christ made and baptized his disciples, and commanded his followers to do as he did; and while the New Testament contains not a single instance of a man coming to Christ and failing from any cause to be baptized, there is not even a show of argument in this scripture. Jesus said, "The one believing and being *baptized* shall be saved."

V. Again he read, "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest." Matthew xi. 28. Here is a precious promise to the poor Jew, weary with his burden of rites and ceremonies, his sacrifices and offerings. Jesus says, "Come unto me, I will give you rest." But just as soon as he comes Christ says, "Be burried with me in baptism." When he comes believing, he obeys. They that come to Christ receive the promised rest, but so far as the New Testament is concerned, these are all baptized. Thus far my position is untouched, for it must be remembered that he set out to find the promise to the unbaptized, i. e. to the one who is not now and never intends to be.

VI. "To him gave all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts x, 43.

But those who believed in Jesus were baptized. (See 48th verse.) Here, then, is a promise to the one who may believe; but baptism follows believing. It is not so with our Pedo-Baptist friends. No doubt the Divine mind always contemplated obedience following faith; hence the believing are regarded as the obedient. To say the least of this Scripture, it seems to have contemplated baptism, since this is the first act required of those who believed.

VII. THE THIEF ON THE CROSS.

Bro. Thurman said: "I admit he may have been baptized; that is, there is a possibility that he was, but I do not think that he was, nor is it necessary for me to prove that he was not." This is certainly bad logic. He was trying to prove that there are promises to the unbaptized. Hence it *was necessary* for him to find a promise to an unbaptized person; i. e. one not to be baptized. Here is a promise to the thief; but has the thief been baptized? We cannot tell. Then this Scripture does not necessarily sustain the proposition. In fine, you cannot prove anything by the unknown. We cannot prove a proposition by any thing that is less certain than the proposition itself. It must first be shown that the thief was not baptized. This cannot be done.

VIII. Mark x, 17-27. Bro. Thurman called our attention specially to the fact that "all things are

possible with God." But what has this to do with his proposition? We know that God can do whatever he wills to do. But it should not be forgotten that he wills to do whatever he does. The question is, Does he will to save those who, having the Bible in their hands, reject baptism through life, and hence die unbaptized? Or, has he so informed us in his Word, that he will do so? We doubt not the power of God, but we do doubt his willingness to save those who will not do His will. This witness does not help him any. We therefore pass to the next.

IX. Romans x, 8-13. This is a blessed truth. all that believe in Jesus shall be saved. But they will confess him with the mouth and obey him. All those in Paul's day, who made confessions, were baptized. Let it be shown that men believe in Jesus, confess him as their Lord and Saviour, and still refuse to be baptized, and we give up our position. If you turn to Acts ii, 21, you will find the words of the prophet: "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." When they asked, "what must we do?" Peter said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you." And then it is written for our instruction, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." May it not be so that all who truly receive in the heart the words of inspiration are baptized? In the days of the Apostles it was most assuredly so. Hence the difficulty to find the

promise to the unbaptized *as such*. At this point of the discussion Bro. Thurman said: "Bro. Coulson would believe and admit Pedo-Baptists to be christians if they were immersed." Here, again, he showed that he did not understand my position. I maintain that Pedo-Baptists do not follow Christ, but Rome; and, while this is the case, they cannot be disciples, though they be immersed a *thousand* times. They have not only set up societies claiming to be churches in opposition to Christ's church, but they oppose and try to bring into disrepute the ordinance Jesus has established. They often make light of the followers of Jesus for obeying him in the requirement of baptism. Of course, if these were to become Baptists, and carry out their professions as disciples, I would gladly receive them as disciples. Nor is it necessary for them to be called Baptists, only let them follow the teachings of the Divine Master and they are his disciples.

X. Bro. Thurman closed his remarks by saying, Bro. Coulson is like Peter, he will not eat with the Gentiles. He says to them, "stand by thyself, we are holier than thou." How hard pressed he must have been for an argument to turn this old and hackneyed illustration of Pedo-Baptists against me! For more than a century they have been saying to us, "You admit that we are christians, but, like Peter, you will not eat with us;" "You say to us stand by thyself, we are holier than thou" Thus they have

endeavored to hold us up before the world in scorn and ridicule. Surely he was *hard* pressed. He admits that Pedo-Baptists are the disciples of Christ, and yet he will not eat with them. He will have them preach for him, but deny them the privilege of eating with him around the table of the Lord. I once heard Dr. Brook, of the Episcopal Church, make this remark: "I was formerly a minister of the Methodist Church," he said; "after I left it, my brother, who is still a Methodist minister, asked me what difference there was between the Methodists and Episcopalians. I said, their teaching are about the same. But Episcopalians *believe* what they teach, while the Methodists *do not*." This, my brethren, is about the difference between my brethren and myself. I believe all that Baptists teach and accept of the consequences. They do not. In one breath they call a man a christian—a disciple of Christ—and with the next refuse him a place in the church, at the table of the Lord, or in any of their deliberative bodies. That is to say, they admit that they are christians, and treat them as if they were not. Pedo-Baptists as firmly believe that they have been baptized, as they do that they are christians. If they are mistaken in the one, may they not be in the other?

CONCLUSION.

Bro. Thurman said, "There are disciples who have not been baptized." He so explained his mean-

ing as to let Pedo-Baptists know that he regarded them as christians, and entitled to all the promises of the New Testament. I stated the negative thus; "There is no discipleship without baptism." I explained it to mean no discipleship that does not result in baptism. I said, when John the Baptist made disciples, he baptized them, and those who rejected his teachings were not baptized. With him it was "believe and obey." Jesus made and baptized his disciples. He commanded his disciples to go make disciples and baptize them. In obedience to this requirement they went forth making and baptizing disciples. So the fact is clearly made out, so far as the teachings of the New Testament are concerned. All the disciples were baptized from the preaching of John the Baptist to the end of the record. So there was no discipleship then that did not result in baptism. Now I simply gave it as my *opinion* that it is just so still. I say one cannot be said to be a disciple of Christ who is unwilling to be baptized. I published my position in the Recorder and explained it thus:

All the disciples were baptized in the days of Christ and the Apostles. It is so now. He that truly repents and believes the gospel will be baptized. As in the former proposition, so in this, the question is not about those going to be baptized. All persons are supposed to be disciples before they ask for baptism. The issue is upon the unwillingness to be

baptized. Can a person be truly discipled and yet be unwilling to be baptized? You answer no, provided he knows what baptism is, or that it is his duty to be baptized. Here even Bro. J. R. Graves, so able upon questions of polemic theology, seems to lose sight of the real nature of the question.

1. A man cannot be said to be unwilling to obey a command that he does not know what it is. If a man does not know it to be his duty to be baptized, he cannot be said to be unwilling to do this.

2. All Pedo-Baptists know that the Bible requires them to be baptized. And, if they desired to know it, could know that baptism is immersion. They translated the New Testament and suppressed the meaning of *baptidzo*, so as to perpetuate rantism. They labor from year to year to show the people that rantism will do as well as baptism. They are all the rejectors of baptism, as taught in the New Testament. If we do not know these things to be true, we do not know anything.

I ask, then, a careful consideration of the foregoing thoughts. Let the real issue be kept before us. My *opinion* is that when we become disciples we will follow Christ in baptism. And if any profess to be disciples, and are unwilling to be baptized, they have made a false profession. Now if *my opinion* should be false, no one will be hurt; for, I love Pedo-Baptists as well as any of my brethren, and can treat them as kindly. But, suppose my *opinion* true—then

it becomes every Pedo-Baptist to look away from his present hopes and put his trust in Jesus as his Saviour.

Brethren, it is a matter of too much moment to pass by lightly. Heaven is to be gained, if we are the disciples of Christ indeed; but if we are not all is lost. I would like to have as much charity as the Bible will let me; but you must remember that charity rejoiceth in the *truth*. Truth and love must go together. "I am not your *enemy*, because I tell you the truth." I claim no superior wisdom over my brethren. I am only an equal and must think for myself. My opinion as to the christianity of Pedo-Baptists has nothing to do with the faith of Baptists. Nor can it be said to be contrary to Scripture, since in this we are taught that those who go out from us are not of us. Much less, then, can we say that those who never came in among us are of us. They stay away because they are not of us. But I must close. I have already detained you too long. I have shown you that the gospel contemplates the obedience of all those who embrace it, and that Jesus purposed to have his people separate themselves from the world in the action of baptism. Go to your homes, not to complain of my opinions, but to ask yourselves the question, in the light of God's truth, "*Are we christians?*" "Ye are my friends," said the Divine Teacher, "if ye *do whatsoever* I command you."

May God, by his grace, make you all what by nature you cannot be, the friends of Jesus; and may

you at last, with the blood-washed millions, find a home in Heaven, and be permitted to join the grand coronation, saying:

“All hail the power of Jesus’ name,
Let angels prostrate fall,
Bring forth the royal diadem,
And crown him Lord of all.”

It is manifest from the preceding that the difference between Bro. Thurman and myself was not so great as at first was supposed. Bro. Thurman, I suppose, saw this afterward, for he has treated me for the four years just passed, as a christian brother. I owe him an apology, perhaps, for some expressions in the sermon that do not manifest as much of the spirit of love as they ought. I can assure him, however, that it was not from a want of respect for him, but a zeal for the truth. I ask the kind reader to note the difference in my position and Brother Thurman’s. He was laboring under the impression that I maintained that a man must be baptized before he could claim a promise made in the New Testament. I had no reference to any promise save that of salvation, and thought only of an obedient subject, or a willing convert. My mind rested wholly upon the teachings of the New Testament and primitive christianity. I may have in my zeal carried the results of my logic too far, but I still think the danger is in erring upon the side of what may be termed a loose christianity. I think we

should contend for a punctilious obedience, even if *we do cut off our own dear selves*. We should preach the truth if the heavens fall. But I again ask, is there anything in this last, or in the previous sermons, or in my writings as now explained, contrary to the faith of Baptists, or contrary to the teachings of the New Testament. You have before you, in the sermons and articles, the sum of my offense ; the crime for which I was condemned by the large and influential body of Baptists known as the Salem Association. I appeal to the brethren everywhere to decide the doubtful case. If I am a heretic, condemn. If I am worthy of stripes or imprisonment, let me bear them. And if I am guilty, I ask that the point at issue be made plain, so the world can see it. Let some one point out the expressions and teachings that are unscriptural and unbaptistic. This is but just, and however excellent the graces of faith, love, and hope, may be, nothing is more pleasing to God than to do justice and judgment in the earth. On the 24th of September, 1868, the messengers and delegates of the churches composing the Salem Association met at Bewleyville, Mead county, Ky., at the baptist house of worship. The preaching of the introductory sermon was postponed, by agreement, till the following day, at 11 o'clock. Bro. John English was chosen moderator, and J. Tol. Miller, clerk.

I arrived at the Association on the morning of the 25th. At the morning session additional churches

were represented, which made the number thirty-two—claiming a total membership of (3,303) three thousand three hundred and three. I call especial attention to the fact, that these thirty-two churches, without a single exception, represented themselves as being *at peace*, at the meeting of the Association. By request, Bro. R. M. Dudley, then Editor of the Western Recorder, preached at 11 o'clock, A. M. He entered the stand and drew from his pocket his sermon on "The Relation of Baptism to Salvation," and read it.

Immediately after the reading of this sermon it was agreed to suspend the regular order of business, for Bro. H. Haynes to offer a resolution. He drew from his pocket and read as follows:

"Whereas, the Salem Association, acting as an advisory council, believes it to be her duty to admonish the Churches which compose her body against the reception of unsound and dangerous doctrines, promulgated either by members of those Churches or others; and whereas, in the opinion of said Association, the doctrine of "No promise in the New Testament to the unbaptized as such," and "No discipleship without baptism," propogated by the Rev. G. Coulson, of Gilead Church, are, in our judgment, both unscriptural and disorganizing; therefore

"Resolved, That we admonish said Church, and all the Churches of the Salem Association, and advise Baptists everywhere, to give neither countenance nor

encouragement to the unscriptural doctrine of those who may thus attempt to sow the seeds of discord among us.

“Resolved, That we agree with the editors of the “Western Recorder and Baptist” that these propositions are not debatable among Baptists, and that pardon, regeneration, justification, and salvation are promised to believers whether baptized or not, and that there are christians who have never been baptized.”

I entered my objections to the resolutions upon the following grounds :

1. I claimed that the Association had no such jurisdiction over the Churches as was claimed in these resolutions. The Association here claims the right to condemn, without trial, one of the members of a sovereign church of Jesus Christ. I said the Association has no such authority. If these resolutions pass it will be an insult to the majesty of the Church at Gilead, which church alone has jurisdiction over my public or private character. I said you may approve or condemn the action of a church, but you can not try or condemn one of her members. I make this point now, and appeal to my brethren everywhere to say, am I not right? Can an Association of Baptists try or condemn one of the members of a church of Jesus Christ? I say, if the Associations can do such a thing, I am not *now* and *never* have been a Baptist. And more than this—if this can be done

by an Association, she must be an ecclesiastical body. None but an ecclesiastical body can try or condemn one of the disciples of Christ. We must be careful here. Christ has committed the government to the churches. If the Association assume such authority, it is treason against the King in Zion. It is a mob taking the law into its own hands. I am satisfied the Association have no such authority. What say you, my brethren? Will you not dare to speak in the defense of truth? I know your decision. Even while I write, my heart leaps with joy to know that from Maine to California, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, your answer will be given: *The Associations have no such authority.*

2. I objected to the resolutions being adopted by the Association because I was then the pastor of four Baptist Churches, and a member of a fifth, which put me in direct fellowship with nearly a thousand Baptists. I said, I am an officer of Gilead Church, and a messenger, sent by her, to this body, with the prayer that you will receive me. You greatly insult the majesty of that Church if you attempt to condemn me, especially for a crime which has not been committed against this body. It is not me, but my Church. I pray you, brethren, do not do such a thing. Vote down these resolutions, and wait till the Church at Gilead shall ask your advice concerning her members. Gilead is responsible for my presence in this body, and by virtue of her authority I

claim my seat in this Association. A good brother¹ said to me then, that this action of the Association was just like the Government. I was a representative from a sovereign Church, sent by the voice of her constituency to that body. The Association could not, therefore, condemn either me or my teachings. She could not sit in judgment upon my conduct as a minister of the gospel.

3. I maintained that these resolutions would lead to strife, discord, and divisions. I said the Churches have been hearing me preach and have been reading my writings. They indorse me by calling me to preach for them. Gilead Church indorses me by sending me here. The Churches to which I preach, and the one of which I am a member, will not blindly submit to the decision of this body. Some, of course, will, and this will be the beginning of divisions and strife. It was said by some that I threatened the Association with division. They mistook my meaning. I said the action of the Association would lead to this. It proved to be too true, as the sequel will show. I did not think there was any just cause for divisions. I knew the adoption of the resolutions would cause them, hence I plead for more time.

4. I objected to the resolutions being passed, from the fact that those who were leading in this matter were too much prejudiced against me to do me justice. And I said, to most of the members of the Association, I am an entire stranger. These have not heard me preach and can not judge of my teachings.

5. I objected to the Preamble, which declared the doctrine I taught to be unscriptural and disorganizing. I said if my teachings are unscriptural it is the business of the Church to decide the fact. I deny that they are as set forth by me. I claimed that it was condemning without trial. I asked simply a fair trial before the proper authority. I said if my Church condemns me I will submit, but my Church has sustained me thus far, and my opinion is it will continue to do so. This will bring the Church and Association into a direct collision. I asked that the matter be referred back to Gilead Church. If the Association wished to impeach me, I said it must do so before the Church, and nowhere else. My position was then, and is still, upon this point, that the Association could not declare my teachings unscriptural and disorganizing without wholly ignoring the authority of the Church. To say a thing is so, is simply to impeach, not to prove; but to pass the resolutions would be to impeach and then condemn without proof. This was done.

6. I objected especially to the second resolution, since it claims that the "Western Recorder and Baptist" held that these questions were not debatable among Baptists. What could this mean? The "Western Recorder" had discussed the question of "no promise," in not less than ten articles, i. e. it had been discussed in the paper. So it was a question with me, and has been to this day, how the Ed-

itor of the "Recorder" could say a question was not debatable which he and his brethren had been debating in his paper for four or five months. I wonder when and where he found out that it was not debatable! And I said of the Editor of the "Baptist," he is a personal friend of mine, and one of the smartest men in the nation, and one among the best theologians; but wise men, even the wisest, will err sometimes. Bro. Graves says, in his paper, the question of "no promise to the unbaptized as such," and "feet washing, and others, are not debatable among Baptists." But how does this tally with HIS conduct? He has had a discussion going on in the "Baptist" for six months upon the subject of feet washing, and he has finally paid \$20 for the best essay on the subject. But I forbear. Why are not these questions debatable among Baptists? And echo answers, Why? And that pardon, regeneration, justification and salvation are *promised* to believers "*whether baptized or not.*" I said leave off the phrase "*whether baptized or not*" and I can indorse this part of the resolution. But it is not true that the Scriptures make such promises whether persons will be baptized or not. To set this in juxtaposition with my view, would be "whether they will to be baptized or not. But they dared not state it thus, for the New Testament contains no such promise. It is true the promise is to the believer, but whether he shall be baptized, the question is not raised in the book. But he is commanded to be bap-

tized, and if he refuse he can not be said to believe, or to have believed in the sense in which saving faith is used in the New Testament. "And there are christians who have never been baptized." I said there may be, but you do not know it. But this is not the point at issue. Can you say there are christians who refuse to be baptized? You dare not say it. Some one spoke up and said, "Do you not say Pedo-baptists are not christians because they are not baptized?" I answered, no. But I do say they are not christians, and one of the many reasons for so saying is because they refuse to be baptized. Here a Cumberland Presbyterian minister said, "I deny the charge, and challenge you to prove it." I told him I would do so at the proper time and place. In the evening he sent me a formal challenge, in writing, to meet him or any man whom they might select to discuss the question! I saw him personally, and said, "sir, you are laboring under a delusion. I maintain that you reject baptism, as the Baptists understand it, i. e. you reject immersion, which with us is the only baptism." He saw the point and gave up the question, saying, "yes, ~~we~~ do." But he said, "*we do not refuse to be baptized.*" I said, "that is another question. I do not have the question to settle with my Baptist brethren as to what baptism is; upon this point we are agreed, and I am agreed with your people that he who refuses to be baptized can not rightly be called a disciple of Christ." But to return from this digres-

sion. I pressed the questions I had raised as to the propriety of the preamble and resolutions pending, being adopted. I said they will work mischief; they will do us harm. After others had replied to my speech, not answering my objections, however, the resolutions were referred to a special committee of three, viz: H. Haynes, G. H. Hicks, and J. T. Miller. The committee requested the visiting ministers to meet with them that evening, at 6 o'clock, and asked me to be present also. We met at the appointed hour, at Bro. Drewrey's. Ministers present—R. L. Thurman, S. L. Helm, R. M. Dudley, Wm. Head, B. F. Jenkins, W. H. Williams, and J. W. Bruner. I offered the following explanation as a basis of agreement:

"No promise to the unbaptized as such," that is, "no promise to the man who is not now and never intends to be baptized, because he wills not to be."

"No discipleship without baptism," that is, "no man can truly be said to be a disciple who refuses to be baptized," or the Scriptures do not speak of any being made christians who were not baptized. These explanations were rejected. This large body of ministers are Baptist ministers, and rejected these explanations with the committee as being wholly unsatisfactory. Why they did so I can not tell, perhaps they can. But the simple question that comes to you is this: Are they satisfactory to you? If so, I am satisfied. Many things are done in haste by wise and good men,

that are not altogether right. An Association once condemned Andrew Broadus, of Virginia, for marrying his first wife's sister as a second wife. This was afterward reconsidered, and Bro. Broadus restored to the fellowship of his brethren. During the sitting of the committee at Bro. Drury's they offered me the following:

“As my teaching in reference to ‘no promise to the unbaptized as such’ seems to be difficult of understanding, I now state that I believe that regeneration, pardon, justification and salvation is (are) promised to the penitent believer before baptism.”

I said I would accept of this as a basis of settlement. It was read to me by Brother R. M. Dudley, and without my knowledge of the fact that it came from the committee. I simply said I would take it as a basis of union. I made some criticisms upon it, but not by way of objecting to the leading idea in it. I think regeneration takes place before penitence or faith, hence it is not promised to the penitent believer, for he who is a penitent believer is such because he has been regenerated, quickened, made alive. I have ever taught, as you see, that pardon, justification, and salvation, are promised and enjoyed that moment a person believes in Christ, hence they properly come before baptism. But I waived all criticisms and said I would occupy it. How strange, then, did the reading of the following appear to me next morning at the meeting of the Association:

“We, your committee, appointed yesterday to report what action this body should take upon the resolutions offered by Bro. Haynes, involving the peculiar doctrines promulgated by Rev. G. A. Coulson, offer the following as the result of their labors:

“The committee, together with the ministers of sister Associations, to whom were referred the resolutions presented by A. Haynes, on yesterday, beg leave to report, that after a protracted and laborious effort, they have been able to obtain no satisfactory explanation or concession from Rev. G. A. Coulson in regard to the objectionable doctrines taught and proclaimed by him, and that, therefore, they report back to the Association the original resolutions, with the recommendation that said resolutions ought to be passed.”

J. Tol. MILLER,
Chairman.

I need light here. Why did these brethren say they were unable to get from me any satisfactory explanation, when I accepted of their proposition? I have learned since, that the committee excused themselves for saying my explanation was not satisfactory from the fact that I did not sign the paper when it was read to me. I said I would take it, in the presence of the room full of brethren, and never thought of signing it. No one asked me to sign it. The names of the committee were not on it. This has always been a dark place to me. Had the committee reported back the result of their labors, and not their own opinions upon the result, the resolutions would not have passed. The difficulty would have ended here. This would have been, it seems to me, the

proper course. They should have said, "We labored with Bro. Coulson for some time last night. He offered the following explanations: 'No promise in the New Testament to the unbaptized as such.' He explained by saying, I mean 'There is no promise to the man who is not now and never intends to be baptized, because he wills not to be,' He says, 'I take baptism to be a public profession of christianity; and if a man refuses to be baptized, he shows that he is not a christian.' "

"No discipleship without baptism." He says by this "I mean the New Testament knows of no discipleship that does not result in baptism. As we would say there is no fever without an increased circulation. Fever always produces increase of circulation. Baptism is produced by discipleship. Make a man a christian and he will be baptized." He also accepts the following as prepared by us:

"As my teachings in reference to no promise to the unbaptized as such, seems to be difficult of understanding, I now state that I believe that regeneration, pardon, justification and salvation is (are) promised to the penitent believer before baptism. We submit, therefore, the result of our labors, and ask to be excused."

I know if such a report had been made the difficulty would have been at an end, and I would not have now been preparing this history. Why it was thus, *I do not know*, but can hope with full confidence

and faith that however dark the hour then appeared, God will overrule it all for his glory and the good of his people. Joseph's brethren sold him for envy, but God sent him to Egypt to keep much people alive. How much of good may yet grow out of this selling me at the Association I do not know, but am satisfied God has a purpose in it. I have learned much by it. I may yet learn more. I trust that the knowledge of the truth shall be made to abound, even by the sending forth of this little book, which would have never been written but from the fact that the resolutions offered by Bro. Haynes were passed by the Association. I saw the storm coming, and plead with my brethren, with tears in my eyes, that morning, to avert it. They saw fit in their wisdom to act otherwise. I left the Association with a broken heart. It was the darkest day I have ever seen, but I put my trust in God and worked on. It was publicly announced during the discussion pending the adoption of the resolutions that if my church sustained me, the resolutions could not hurt me. I returned home and laid my case before my church. I said *here* I must stand or fall. On the 26th of December I met with Nilead Church, that an investigation might be had as to my teachings. At the first meeting of the Church after the Association adjourned, Bro. John O'Neal, the Clerk, offered the following preamble and resolution:

“Inasmuch as Salem Association has thought proper in her wisdom to advise this Church in reference to the doctrine preached by Elder G. A. Coulson, as set forth in resolutions passed by that body, viz: ‘No promise to the unbaptized as such,’ and ‘No discipleship without baptism,’ therefore

Resolved, That with due respect to the advice and action of the Association, we think proper to take some step of action. And being desirous to arrive at a fair, just, and impartial conclusion of the truth, we therefore solicit the aid of the several sister churches to which Elder G. A. Coulson has been preaching, to send a delegation to council with, and aid us in trying to arrive at the truth on these questions.”

They passed, but were afterward reconsidered, and the Church decided to try the case herself. As I have stated, the Church met at her regular meeting, in December, to try the case. But you may judge of our surprise, when we tell you that just as the Church was about to take up the question and investigate it, Bro. J. Tol. Miller arose and made a speech, and closed by calling on all that were going with the Association, to rise to their feet. Some few of the members got up, and Bro. Miller asked to be excused, saying he was going to leave the Church, and called on all that would follow, to come on. Several followed him, and thus the Church was divided; but the main body of the Church remained and proceeded with the business. It was decided to wait till the next meeting to take up my case. At the January meeting a committee was appointed, to draft resolutions

on the case of doctrine, and to report at the March meeting. At this time I set forth my explanations before the Church, and was unanimously received by the Church, (i. e. the members then composing the Church) as sound in the faith. Prof. J. W. Rust, and J. M. Weaver, of Louisville, being present, agreed that the explanations were satisfactory, and Prof. Rust so reported, through the columns of the "Recorder," the following week.

But the explanations were not satisfactory to the minority party of Gilead Church. It remained divided till the meeting of the Association, in September. I closed my school in Hodgenville, June 18, 1869. I continued to preach, from place to place, till the meeting of the Association, in September.

In the "Baptist," published in Memphis, and edited by Elder J. R. Graves, was published the following explanation, May 15, 1869:

EXPLANATION.

"*Brother Graves*: You will oblige me by publishing the following explanation: It seems to me that some of my friends do not clearly understand my position upon the design and effect of christian baptism. I, perhaps, am to blame in the matter. I may have failed to be sufficiently explicit upon these points, having other points in view.

"I would like to say now, once for all, that I have ever looked upon the design of baptism as being symbolical to wash away our sins, to remit our sins, to put on Christ, to enter into the spirit, etc. Baptism,

therefore, is designed to illustrate all that there is in the christian profession. It is the symbol of Christianity.

“Now, if you take away the baptism, I know of no other way to illustrate, demonstrate our salvation, deliverance from sin, connection with Christ, etc. Yet anything may truly exist without a demonstration, illustration, etc., as with it. Christ appointed it as a law unto his people, that in this way they should make the demonstration of their acceptance of him. All, therefore, will be saved, are saved, who put their trust in Christ, without baptism, as with it. But the question may rightly be asked, Will His people refuse to profess Him in baptism? The effect of baptism is not, therefore, to give salvation, but to make a demonstration of it. If a man truly repents and believes, and wishes to follow Christ in all things, though he should not have an opportunity to be baptized, yet as a believer in Christ, he is saved. I hope this is clear enough to separate me from any tincture of heresy. Much as I may love my friends, I can not promise them salvation while they live in continual disobedience of a single command of His. “By their fruits ye shall know them.” “He that keepeth my commandments, he it is that loveth me.” If the rejector of baptism believe on him, have the fruits, and keep his commandments, I can not see it. I hope, therefore, my brethren will excuse my apparent want of charity, and extend to me that charity they would have me extend to others.

Yours, with many thanks for what you have done for me in my trials. May God reward you.”

G. A. COULSON.

I also prepared and preached the following sermon at White Mills, Hardin county, Ky., in answer to the one preached by Bro. R. M. Dudley before the Salem Association at Bewleyville.

“THE RELATION OF BAPTISM TO SALVATION.”

The like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” I. Pet. iii, 21.

Bro. Dudley announced, “The Bible clearly reveals that there exists a certain relation between baptism and salvation.” The object of the sermon is to show what that relation is. He discusses the subject under two divisions :

1. “*What connection does baptism sustain to the resurrection of Christ?*”

2. “*What connection does the resurrection of Christ sustain to salvation?*”

Under the first he says: “Baptism is a symbol—a representation—a re-presentation, if you please, of this great event, viz: the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ.” “Baptism is the shadowing forth, in a most striking manner, the burial and resurrection of Christ.” Here I would suggest, that the representation of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ in baptism is merely incidental. There is not the slightest intimation given in the New Testa-

ment, that it is given for this purpose. We are never commanded to observe it to this end. Hence, we may *know* this was not the original design. The Supper is given to perpetuate the memory of His death till he comes again. This is not, therefore, the design of Christian baptism. Bro. Dudley takes in this place that which is incidental for the connection. When Jesus rose from the dead he gave no new baptism, but a *new* commission. The first commission extended only to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. After the resurrection he extended it to the *whole world*. His disciples were to proclaim the *good news* to all the world. This good news is the fact that Jesus died for our sins, that he was buried, and that He rose again for our justification. All those receiving this fact, believing it in their hearts, are declared to be saved. But the belief of this must be in the heart; or it will not save. Jesus must be received by us as *our* sacrifice, or we are not saved. This faith in Christ saves us from the wrath of God; baptism saves us from the world by separating us from it. As the sprinkling of the blood of the Paschal Lamb upon the doors of the children of Israel saved them from the wrath of God, so their baptism in passing through the Red Sea, saved them from the Egyptians. As the Ark which Noah built, saved himself and his family from the wrath of God which fell upon the wicked world, so were they saved *by water*, as a means from the wicked people, i. e. from

the influence of the wicked. The water saved Noah and his family, by separating them from the wicked world.

Even so doth baptism *now save* us. The blood of Christ, received by faith, saved us from the wrath of God. Christ is our Paschal Lamb, sacrificed for us, and his blood applied by faith, sprinkled upon our hearts, saves us from the wrath of God. Baptism is Christ's appointed means for saving us from the influence of the world. Therefore, we are *saved* by baptism. God said, "When I see the blood I will pass over you." So it is now, when God sees the blood of his Son upon us, he passes by our transgressions. He is merciful to our unrighteousness. When the children of Israel passed over the Red Sea they sang the song of deliverance. They said, "Our enemies are as still as a stone." God had spoken to them, through his servant Moses, to "*go through the sea.*" They obeyed and soon found themselves safe on the other shore. They saw their enemies, however, sink down amid the roar of the darkened waters. Israel is now saved by baptism. He is separated from the world. He can no longer be under its influence.

But our Brother's object is to show the connection or relation that baptism has to the resurrection of Christ. Baptism does not seem to have any real connection with the death of Christ, for it was administered before this event occurred. But the resurrec-

tion of Christ does have some relation to baptism, i. e. Christian baptism. If there had been no resurrection, this rite would have ceased. The resurrection of Christ is an absolute necessity that this ordinance, which he has established, may be perpetuated. Baptism, therefore, beautifully illustrates our faith in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Baptism is a meaningless ceremony, a perfect farce, without the resurrection of Christ. But baptism does not prove that the resurrection has taken place; it must first be shown that the resurrection has taken place, before baptism can be anything. When this is shown, and we receive the fact, we manifest our acceptance by being baptized. Those who are baptized set forth their *faith in the resurrection*, and not the fact that there is a resurrection. Those who are not baptized, fail to set forth this faith to the world. Those that believed the preaching of John the Baptist were baptized, setting forth the fact that they would accept the coming Messiah. Those who did not receive the teaching of John were not baptized by him, and they did not receive Christ. May it not be so now, that those who refuse Christ's baptism, reject him. But what shall we say of those who oppose baptism, i. e. immersion, which alone is baptism, and labor for its annihilation, having substituted sprinkling and pouring in the place of baptism? Who, with a zeal and energy worthy of a better cause, labor to banish from the world that "re-presentation" and

“miniture” picture of Christ’s death and resurrection—are *they* the followers of our Lord Jesus Christ? Are *they* saved from the world? But all Protestants and Catholics do this; whether ignorantly or otherwise, is no question now.

It is a fact that this is one of the leading objects of their lives. And if they could accomplish the work, we would never have another re-presentation of the faith of a believer in the death of Christ in baptism. But Bro. Dudley says, “It is the re-presentation of the *death* of Christ.” It is a picture, a beautiful “miniature.” But Protestants and Catholics hold that it is the Divine requirement for all christian parents to have their children “christened,” and this they call baptism. Let them succeed in their efforts and we will never have another christian baptism; no more re-presentations of Christ’s death in baptism. How cold and cheerless is the mere thought of such a state of affairs in the world to a devoted lover of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But Bro. Dudley tells us in the Appendix to this sermon, that these Protestants are the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ—that they are the followers of him, whose death and resurrection baptism is designed to represent. And more than this; he affirms that if we believe that such departure from the command of Christ disqualifies for discipleship, then we are no longer believing the truth, and have departed from the faith of Baptists, and gone contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures.

Under the second question, viz ; “What connection does the resurrection of Christ sustain to salvation?” He says: “The resurrection of Christ, together with his proposed death, is the grand agency which God employs in redeeming, pardoning, justifying, and glorifying the sinner.” Again he says: “As baptism is the emblem of the resurrection of Christ, and as the resurrection of Christ is the grand agency which God employs for the salvation of men, baptism is the emblem of what saves us.”

I call your attention, my brethren, to the above quotation. For if the resurrection of Jesus is the “grand agency” which God employs to redeem the world (and it is), then the grand agency of the disciples of Christ is to set forth this fact to the world ; for this is their mission in the world to set forth Christ crucified to perishing sinners. Then since baptism is to set forth this fact, all the disciples of Christ ought to be baptized. Nor can they fail to do so and be guiltless. Again, I ask, what of those who not only refuse themselves to be baptized, but also spend their time and talent in persuading others not to be? Do they not hide this salvation from men?

Bro. Dudley says, “Baptism is the EMBLEM of what saves us.” A flag is the emblem of a country. Can a man insult the flag, and not insult the nation which it represents? Can a man despise the flag of his country, and not despise his country? Can an American treat contemptuously the “STARSPANGLED BAN-

NER," and yet be a loyal citizen? Can he substitute the LION for the EAGLE, and persuade every body to do so, and yet be an American citizen? I ask, can this be so? "Baptism is the emblem of what saves us." All Protestants and Catholics despise and reject the EMBLEM of our salvation. Are these the subjects of His grace, who died to save us? •

Pedo-Baptists in this country, from Maine to California, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, speak contemptuously of baptism, i. e. immersion, and many of them say it is not taught in the Word of God. Now if immersion is baptism, and you all say it is, then these men deride and insult the Great Lawgiver in Zion; because, to insult the symbol of our religion, is to insult the author of it. Jesus appointed baptism, i. e. immersion, as the symbol of what saves us, and said to his followers, "Go, disciples, to the nations, baptizing them." And "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." *To reject baptism is to reject Christ.* But Bro. Dudley says "To teach this is a *dangerous heresy*;" "worse," says he, "than the heresy which Alexander Campbell taught." He says "Pedo-Baptists are the disciples of Christ"—"they are christians." Then, my brethren, there is one fact which must be patent to all; more of the disciples of Christ are trying to remove the "emblem" of what saves us than are trying to set it forth. Then the majority of His disciples are trying to hide this salvation from the world.

Bro. Dudley says, if my position be true we may well ask, "Who can be saved?" I would say in reply, if *his* position be true, "Who *can not* be saved?" Can Bro. Dudley suppose that he will win the favor of Heaven, or gain the smiles of Jehovah by pleading for the christianity of those who would forever drive from the earth the representation of Christ's death and resurrection? When the belief of these facts are necessary to the salvation of every sinner? Should *he* not pause and think before he proceeds further? May *he* not be *honestly* mistaken in believing that a man may be saved in heaven, who will not be baptized, *because he wills not to be*? Might he not find, when too late, that the words of Jesus are literally true when he says, "He that keepeth my commandments, he it is that loveth me." How great the responsibility for a mortal man to take upon himself to say how far a man may go in disobeying Christ and yet he be "a christian, and entitled to a home in heaven!! Once more he says, "Here, then, is the character of persons to be baptized"—"persons who have a good conscience"—"persons whose consciences have been purged by an application of the blood of Christ; persons who are born of God, and cleansed from all sin." My brethren, let us carefully note the above character of persons to be baptized. 1. *A good conscience.* 2. *Conscience purged from sin by blood.* 3. *Born of God.* 4. *Cleansed from all sin.* Now I hesitate not to say that there is

not a Protestant or Catholic in the world that can come to such a Baptism without he repent. What follows? Bro. Dudley has set up the "Lord marks," so that no Pedit-baptist can ever come to Christ's baptism, i. e. the baptism required by Christ, till he be converted from the error of his ways and turn from his sins. If this be not the case, Pelagianism is true, and it makes no difference what a man does so he thinks he is right. But he says, "They are christians, but are so much under the power of former prejudice, education, etc., etc. ; that they do not know what baptism is, and that in the sight of Heaven's King they are excused for their opposition to christian baptism, and are, after all, the disciples of Christ, and have the promise of that rest that remains to the people of God. In fine, persons to be entitled to baptism must be 'cleansed from all sin.' But they may enter heaven with the sins of prejudice, and rejection of baptism, resting upon them. Unless prejudice and rejection of baptism be no sin. Let us look at this still more closely, if possible. What! a man cleansed from *all sin!* and yet under the power of prejudice and former teachings, so that he can not understand the plain commands of Christ to be immersed, and to immerse only penitent believers? And in his blind prejudice substitutes the rantism of little babes in the place of believer's baptism, and rejects baptism himself, because his parents in *their* kindness had him sprinkled when a babe. Yet this

man is cleansed from all sin, born of God, turned from darkness to the true light, from the power of satan unto God. That is, refusing to be baptized, substituting infant sprinkling in the place of baptism, etc, is not sinning, i. e. such persons are cleansed from all sin. And these things do not justify me in coming to the conclusion that such persons are not the meek and lowly followers of Christ. That is, a Baptist minister who attempts to show from these things that Protestants are not christians, deserves to be branded as a *heretic*, excluded from the church; deserves no aid or comfort from Baptists. Some persons accuse me of being "*crazy*" If Bro. Dudley's appendix to this sermon grew out of the reasoning in the body of the sermon, then I plead guilty to the charge, and ask my brethren henceforth to pity, not to blame. But, brethren, "I am not mad," but speak forth the words of truth and soberness. I maintain that a man must be saved from sin to be a fit subject for christian baptism, but I do not maintain that he has the promise of heaven without being saved. And if a man is saved from sin, he is saved from his former prejudices, so it seems to me.

Ah! blind indeed must be the prejudice, stupid the mind, and cold the heart, that can not see and feel that Bro. Dudley, in order to oppose ~~my~~ views, spoiled a good sermon by this appendix, and placed himself before the world as a tool for a party. I can truly say he is welcome to all the "*laurels*" he has won in

coming forth as the champion to defend the Christianity of Pedo-Baptists, upon the score of prejudice and ignorance. For if prejudice and education made them what they are, I can not tell but what prejudice and education made *him* what he is. His Pedo-Baptist friends can well retort, "It is nothing but prejudice and the force of education that makes you go about preaching immersion for baptism, and plunging the people into ponds, lakes, creeks, and rivers." And this is the end of all argument. One says "*Katy did*," and the other says "*Katy didn't*." He has long since been informed by one of his learned Pedo-Baptist brethren, "That immersion is no baptism, yet it will do for negroes and ignorant Baptists." Who does not see that to admit such a theory is fatal to the cause of truth? If the converted man can not know that it is his duty to be baptized, and if he can not know what baptism is, the New Testament becomes on this question a sealed book, and the Quakers, or Friends, are right in rejecting water baptism altogether. But who shall tell us we may not know? May not the man who tells us we can not know, be mistaken? For us, as Baptists, to claim that *we know* that early training, former prejudices, etc., are the only reasons why they reject christian baptism, is to claim a superiority over our brethren, that is more ridiculous than the claim of Rome to the infallibility of the Pope. Let us suppose a case. Rev. R. M. Dudley, and Dr. Quintard, of the Episcopal Church,

are seated together when the following conversation occurs. Mr. Dudley says, "Bro. Quintard, I admit you are a christian, yet it is very strange to me how you can let prejudice and early education have such an influence over you. I do not see how a man of your attainments in the sciences, can propagate that 'abominable falsehood of baptismal regeneration'—with all that miserable stuff of 'baby sprinkling,' infant membership, sprinkling and pouring for baptism, confirmation, etc., etc., etc." The Rev. Dr. looks gravely at the young man and says, "You are quite a presumptuous youth. How do *you* know that early education made *me* what I am, and that it did not make *you* what you are? Since it is God that makes us to differ, may it not be that He made me what I am, and prejudice and education made you what you are?" May this not be the case? Bro. Dudley must sit in silence, and hang his head in shame. He could not answer him a word, since God has nowhere revealed to Bro. D. the fact that *he* has been delivered from the power of these influences, nor that his brother has been left in the dark. The question as to which one of them is in the dark, can not be settled by an appeal to the word of God. If left to the general decision of mankind, the overwhelming majority would decide in favor of the Dr. and against Bro. D. The admission, my brethren, is fatal to our cause, and I am astonished that a good Baptist preacher should waste his time and talent in maintaining such a hypoth-

esis. Let us take the position that we are christians that we have been enlightened by the Holy Spirit, that we have been taught of God, and led by the Spirit into the truth. One manifestation of this fact is that we keep the commands of Christ. Here is our only safety. We *know* in whom we have believed. We *know* we have passed from death to life. Brethren, if this is not the case we are on a sea, without compass or chart. All is doubt, and we are still in darkness.

Once more, Bro. Dudley says, "Jesus has made it the duty of all his disciples to be baptized." Also "The conscience that has been purged from dead works, to serve the living God, demands obedience to this command." Here, then, is a Divine requirement to be baptized, a purged conscience demanding it. But how, my brethren, is the case with Pedo-Baptists? If they are christians, (and Bro. Dudley says they are) Jesus requires baptism of them. If they are christians, then they have the purged conscience demanding baptism. How, then, can they refuse to submit to Christ's requirement? Or how can they lull that conscience to sleep by saying, "My parents had me baptized in infancy, and I would not, for the world, believe that this is not baptism." How is it that they pass through life perfectly satisfied without being baptized? Not only do they take this christening for baptism, but they give it in turn to their children, and teach these to regard it as baptism.

Thus they take, as far as possible, believer's baptism (the only christian baptism) from the world, and I am required to believe that these are the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ. And if I can not believe it, and so teach, I ought to be excluded from the congregation of the Lord. If my opinion is, that these people have not been truly converted of the Lord, and that they are not the followers of Christ, then, says Bro. Dudley, "Let him be *anathema maranatha*."

It may be a weakness in me, but I cannot help it; if Heaven is to be alike the home of him who believes and is baptized, and of him who refuses baptism, and puts it far from him, I cannot see much use in the commission—"Go disciple the nations, baptizing them." I do not understand why Christ should say, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," when he that is *not* baptized shall be saved as well as the one that is. Why should Peter upon the day of Pentecost say, "Repent every one of you and each be baptized," in answer to the question, "What must we do?" If the baptized and the unbaptized, i. e. those refusing to be baptized are alike the disciples of Christ, why did Paul not tarry to be baptized, and why this haste for the Jailor and his household, that they should be baptized in the night! when the Eunuch said, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? Why did Philip not say, you may if you wish, but there is no use being in haste about it, you are just as much a disciple without it as with it?"

But all these things weigh nothing with Bro. Dudley. He admits that we ought to be baptized; that it is God's requirement; that the conscience of the christian demands it. But with him Pedit-Baptists meet with commiseration, because they do not *know* what baptism is. Poor ignorant creatures; they have learning and talent for everything else, but this. They have the Bible in their hands, hence the teachings of Jesus before them. But prejudice and early training prevents them from knowing their duty.

Now I venture to assert here that Christ and the Apostles never placed the rejection of their teachings upon any other ground than a want of a heart to receive them. Jesus said, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Matt. xi. 25, 26.

But Bro. Dudley's position would lead us to say, Father, thou hast revealed our duty to us as Baptists, but thou hast not so revealed this duty to Pedit-Baptists, yet we are all thy children. Talk of "strange notions," ha! If he does not have them I do not know who has. Protestants, the offspring of Rome, and at the same time the Bride of Christ and his disciples!!

But I must call your attention again to this Appendix of his. It is certainly a marvelous production. He says; "*From the views of baptism already*

established it is evident that a man may be a christian who never has been nor ever may be baptized.'" What a conclusion! It is *evident*—evident from what? The views established. Baptism is the requirement of God, and is demanded by the enlightened conscience. It is related to the death of Christ, and is a means of setting forth the resurrection of Christ. All christians are required to submit to it, and yet there are christians who are not now, and never intend to be baptized. I venture to say, with our Dr. Naugh as he said of a preacher's text and sermon, that if Bro. Dudley's sermon had the small-pox, his Appendix would be in no danger of catching it. To my mind there is no connection between this sermon and the appendix. He proceeds: "*This, in the judgment of Scripture, we take to be the case of Pedo-Baptists.*" That they are christians, is his idea, although they have not and never intend to be baptized. Where is the Scripture to justify the opinion? Where? and echo answers where? And I must ask your attention again to the fact that "All Protestant denominations, with the Catholics, teach in their standard works just as I do upon this question of baptism. With them there is no church without baptism—no christianity without it, and with many of them there is no salvation without baptism. But Bro. Dudley says, "*Pedo-Baptists are christians, but they are not baptized.*" By whose authority does he make this assertion? He would say, no doubt, that from God's

Word we learn what baptism is, "It is, the immersion of a penitent believer in water upon a profession of his faith in Christ." But all his Protestant and Catholic neighbors deny this.

They say immersion is not necessary to christian baptism, and infants are proper subjects for this ordinance. Here then, is a direct contradiction. And yet these are the disciples of Christ—all of them christians. Pede-baptists as much believe that they have been baptized as they do that they are christians. Bro. Dudley sets up his judgment against them upon the question of baptism. Why may I not as to the fact of their being christians? May not the latter be as uncertain as the former? But Bro. D. proposes to turn me out upon the cold charities of the world, excommunicating me from the church, giving me neither aid nor countenance because my opinion is, that in the judgment of Scripture, Pede-baptists are *not* the disciples of Christ. Why is this? May I not be a christian and be mistaken upon this point? Is it necessary to christianity for a man to believe that Pede-baptists are christians? Concerning the design and action of baptism Bro. D. and his Pede-baptist brethren are the poles apart. And yet each regards the other as a christian. Why cannot Bro. Dudley regard me as a christian and a baptist, if I cannot see as he does as to the christianity of Protestants and Catholics? Again he says:

“The Scriptures afford no warrant for saying that they are not christians because they have never submitted to immersion; and we exceedingly regret, that any sound Baptist should ever have engaged his time and talent upon such an unprofitable issue.” I called Bro. Dudley’s attention to the fact that he did not fairly represent me in this statement when he was reading the sermon. I did hope he would change the sentence before publication so as to meet the direct issue. But as he does not I must explain: I do not maintain that Pedo-baptists are not christians *because* they have not submitted to immersion. But I do maintain that they have not submitted to immersion *because* they are not christians. I am satisfied that if they had been born of God—had had their conscience cleansed by the application of the blood of Christ from all sin—and had received the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit, they would have been immersed. This is the true issue. I judge the tree by its fruits. If the fruit is good, I say the tree is good, but if the fruit is bad; then I maintain that the tree is bad; but the tree is not bad because the fruit is. But the fruit is, because the tree is bad. I submit a few reasons then as a “warrant” for what I have said.

John the Baptist, the harbinger of the coming glory of the gospel dispensation, required repentance, faith and baptism: Those who received his teachings were baptized of him, those who rejected the teachings of John were not baptized of him.

Jesus, our Lord and Master, was batized and said: "thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." He went forth from his baptism, preaching the kingdom of Heaven. His disciples, by his authority, baptizing all those made disciples. Raising from the dead, He commissioned his disciples to disciple the nations and baptize them. He said "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The disciples acting under this commission went forth, beginning at Jerusalem, and as many as gladly received the word were baptized. There cannot be found in all the New Testament a single case where a man or woman became a christian, who was not immediately immersed. And after all this there is no "warrant" for me to say that those who refuse immersion are not christians. That is to say in the light of Scripture there is no question as to the christianity of Pedeo-baptists. 2d. They stand as excluded and rejected from the Church of Christ, and from all its immunities, privileges, and benefits. And a man sins most egregiously against a baptist church, Salem Association and the baptists of Kentucky, if he maintains that they are not christians. There is no "warrant" for saying they are not. I do not decide upon the importance of baptism. The Scriptures do not say any one will be damned for the want of it. They do not say any one will be saved without it. Bro. Dudley's text incidently sets

forth the fact that all christians are baptized. It says: "Few, that is eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us," *i. e.* all of us. All that were saved were saved *by water*, all that are saved now are saved *by baptism*. The water saved Noah from the wicked world, baptism saves us, so says the Apostle. That is, as the water separated Noah and his family from the wicked, so baptism saves us from the world by separating us from it.

The Brother seems not to have observed the difference between a moral duty and a positive command, nor the difference between our "opinions" concerning the teachings of the Bible upon great doctrinal questions, and positive commands. He urges that by the same process of reasoning that I have adopted to show that the rejectors of baptism are not christians, a Calvinist would deny salvation to an Armenian, a Pre-millennialist to a Post-millennialist, &c. This is certainly wonderful, for a teacher in Israel! If Jesus had said "He that believeth and is a Calvinist shall be saved," I would not have promised salvation to an Armenian. If he had said, "He that believeth and is a Pre-millennialist will be saved," I would have been slow to say the Post-millennialist will be saved also. If Jesus had said "He that believeth and gives one tenth of his yearly income to the preaching of the gospel shall be saved," Bro. Dudley would

hardly say to those who give one twentieth, you also shall be saved. I would have you, my brethren, stand in awe of the Word of God. He that has a loose faith is likely to have a loose conduct. In all the preaching of the Apostles, left on Record, there is not a word, as to what we shall believe upon the subject of election, predestination, free agency, &c. In the Epistle to the Churches, the members of which are all christians, and have all been baptized, they give the instructions necessary for christians upon these questions. But when preaching to sinners they said: "Jesus is the Christ, repent, believe, and be baptized." Hence it is clear that these are the first principles of christianity, after these came the teachings upon christian duty and christian faith. The more I examine this Appendix the more am I astonished. Bro. Dudley must have been laboring under some abnormal condition of mind when he was preparing this. Surely he could not have been in his sober senses, prayerfully trying to say something for the glory of God, and the advancement of his cause. But what has he gained? Thousands of Pedo-baptists will say I am all right—I am a christian and that is enough for me. But if he is wrong what then? Let him answer. My opinion is still that the only safety for the dying sinner is, *repentance toward God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and a punctilious obedience to all his commands.*

"Be ye holy as I am holy," says the Lord God of Hosts. Bro. D. claims that I am wrong if I maintain that those who refuse to obey a single command of Christ's are not Christians. I am a heretic. May the Lord God forgive me if I ever say more or less than what he has said. I would follow the truth as it is in Jesus. He has said: "He that keepeth my commandments, he it is that loveth me." "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." "He that keepeth my sayings shall live forever." But I must close, I have already detained you too long. May peace, mercy and truth be with you, and may you abound yet more and more in the work of the Lord. Amen.

A month or two after preaching this sermon I revised and enlarged it for publication. I read the manuscript to Bro. J. M. Weaver, of Louisville, and Prof. J. W. Rust, then junior Editor of the Western Recorder.

Owing to the excitement, they advised not to publish it. A short time after this I prepared the following article for the Western Recorder and sent it to the publishers. It was returned:

For the Western Recorder.

"SHOULD WE BE DIVIDED?"

Bro. Dudley says: "*As a test of love and fealty to Christ, baptism is essential to salvation in the sense that he who professes the former and is unwilling to submit to the latter, proves by his very unwillingness*

that he is destitute of both love and fealty to Christ. In this sense then the New Testament contains no promise to the unbaptized or the unbaptized as such, *I care not which.*" I take the following to be the sense of the above: There is no salvation or promise of salvation to the man who is unwilling to be baptized. I grant that he is a little "*infelicitous*" in the choice of terms. I do not think he means that a man cannot be saved without being baptized, nor do I think he means that a man is saved by baptism, in the sense of being redeemed from sin. Hence he did not mean that baptism is *essential* to salvation in the sense that salvation cannot exist or be given without it. But that it is essential to a demonstration of our love and fealty to Christ. He means that allegiance to Christ is essential to our individual or actual salvation, and that baptism is essential to a demonstration of this allegiance—*i. e.* a willingness to be baptized. Unwillingness, upon the part of any one, would show that he is still disloyal to the King in Zion. Every thing depends upon the submission of the *will* of the creature to the will of the Creator. Now, I ask, how could Bro. Dudley indorse the following from Salem Association? "Resolved that we agree * * * * that pardon, regeneration, justification and salvation, are promised to believers whether baptized or not. And that there are christians who have never been baptized." If the associa-

tion intends to say that pardon, justification and salvation are promised *before* baptism—*i. e.* that the promise exists before the baptism, I most heartily agree with it. So may Bro. Dudley, but if it means that a man who is not now, and never intends to be baptized, because he is not willing, I cannot endorse the view at all, I most heartily dissent from it. Bro. D. must also or contradict himself, or take back what he has said as quoted above. The Association intended this to be the opposite of my views, which are, that all christians desire to be baptized, and that they may all know what baptism is. The Association intended to make the impression upon the world that I taught baptismal regeneration. But I have said time and again; that all true believers have the promise of salvation that moment they believe, but my opinion is, that they are all baptized the first opportunity that offers. That they all desire to obey the Savior in this ordinance. Hence, I would not receive any into the church till they are baptized; in this my brethren all agree with me. I shall be glad for the Association, at its next meeting, to so modify these resolutions that they may be definite. As to unbaptized christians, we must say again, if the Association intends, by this, that there are christians who live through life without being baptized, I can only say it is a matter of opinion. I do not think there are any such; if my brethren

think so, it is their privilege. Christianity means a system of religion established by Christ. He established but one system. It would be folly to deny that in this, baptism occupies a prominent place. We can truly say there is no christianity, *i. e.* christian system without baptism.

And if a man had done every thing required in the system given, except being baptized, it might be said of him: "One thing thou lackest yet." Christ was, himself, baptized, and requires all his followers to be. Hence, he who refuses to be baptized is not a christian. In this, all theologians and commentators are agreed. My brethren claim, in common with myself, that there is no salvation or *promise* of salvation to those who are unwilling to be baptized. • Our difference is this: They claim that Pedo-baptists are willing to be baptized, I do not think so. We are agreed that the immersion of the body in water upon a profession of faith in Christ is baptism, and that nothing else is. This we all know Pedo-baptists reject. Hence, we are agreed that Pedo-baptists are unbaptized. But the opinion of my brethren is that Pedo-baptists reject baptism *ignorantly*, and therefore are excused. I think they reject it *willfully*, and hence that they are not excusable.

My brethren say if Pedo-baptists knew what baptism is they would receive it. I maintain that the reason they do not know is because they do

not wish to know. And that the whole trouble about the matter is, that the heart is not right. My brethren say: "They are so blinded by prejudice and education that they cannot understand the teachings of the New Testament upon this subject." And upon this hypothesis they are willing to found their faith, and exclude all those from our churches who will not agree with them. I maintain that this is a departure from our established confession of faith. It is a universally expressed principle with Baptists, that *nothing* shall be made a test of fellowship but a departure from the teachings of the word of God. I, with those who agree with me as to the christianity of the unbaptized, am willing to live in fellowship with those who differ from us. They may believe just as they please as to those that are not of us. We honestly differ, but the difference has nothing to do with our fellowship as brethren. We only ask to be allowed *our* opinions. I ask again should we be divided? I answer no. I maintain that all persons whose hearts are renewed by divine grace will be baptized, *i. e. immersed*. This is my opinion. May I not be allowed to hold it, and maintain it, and yet be a Baptist, and a christian? Brethren of the Holy calling, partakers of the Divine nature, quickened by the same Spirit, possessing the same glorious hope, children of the same Great God, heirs of the same inheritance, which is incorrup-

tible, undefiled, and fadeth not away, let us not be divided. May you decide the question in the fear of God and answer no.

I moved my fellowship from Gilead Church to Hodgenville in this year; so that at the next Associational meeting, which was at Pleasant View Church, Hardin Co., Ky., September 23-24-25, 1869. Gilead Church and Hodgenville Church were in a divided condition. I was of course the object of the contention. The party that endorsed the previous action of the Association contended that the churches should withdraw their fellowship from me. The other party contending that my teachings were neither unscriptural nor disorganizing. A large majority in the Hodgenville Church was of this opinion, and they were brethren and sisters that had been the pillars of the church for years. It was the same way in Gilead and White Mills Church. I did all I could to harmonize the parties except recant. This I could not do while my opinions were the same. I proclaimed my views every where, to let the people know them. But I said I did not wish others to adopt them unless they felt their truthfulness. I only asked to be allowed to believe and teach those things. This the churches granted me, I did fondly hope the Association would do the same at its coming session.

CHAPTER III—THIRD YEAR IN KENTUCKY.

But when we met. Gilead Church had two letters and two sets of delegates. A protest was carried up from Hodgenville Church. In this some very grave charges were made against me and the church. The Association acted very unwisely in permitting the protest to be read, since it was setting a precedent for a few disorderly members at any time to bring confusion into the Association. But by the dominant party this was thought of sufficient importance to send the delegation of the church before a committee. The committee kept the delegates out of the Association till they asked to be excused to go home and settle their own difficulties. This was granted, so the question was not settled before the Association. I went home from this meeting thoroughly convinced of the fact that there is no accounting for what men will do under the influence of prejudice. I continued to preach in the Association and out of it, for the next year. I denounced the action of the Association as being both tyrannical and unbaptistic. She interfered with the independence of the churches. She sent the delegation of a sovereign church before a Committee and kept them out of the Association, upon the hypothesis that there were several claimants. I was in the delegation, I claimed my seat in the Association, because I was sent there

by a sovereign church, which was an intregal part of the body, but my brethren thought the matter would soon be settled before the Committee, and although regarding it as unlawful for the Association to send them before the Committee, in the hope of making peace, they went. I refused to do so, because I knew it was unlawful. It terminated as I anticipated, and we returned home to find ourselves in no better condition. I submit the resolution of this body after having passed through a year of trouble. The reader will remember that I opposed the adoption of the original resolutions because they would bring about divisions in our churches. This they did. Now behold the consistency of that body. She says:

Whereas, The Salem Association at Bewleyville, in Spetember, 1868, passed resolutions condemning the doctrine of "no promise in the New Testament to the unbaptized as such," and "no discipleship without baptism," as taught by the Rev. G. G. Colson; and whereas, in our judgment, said doctrine is dangerous, inconsistent with Bible teaching, and disorganizing in its effects, Therefore:

Resolved, That we reiterate the advice to the churches composing the Association, not to encourage the man promulgating said doctrine; and that we will not receive messengers from any church which calls or retains such a minister as pastor.

Resolved further, That if any church should disregard this advice, a respectable minority of said church ought, at their regular meeting, to declare publicly their determination to present themselves to Salem Association as the church, declaring non-fellowship for the doctrine above discribed; and such a minority, in our judgment, ought to be received as the church instead of others who have departed from the faith of Baptists.

The Association had met in 1868—all the churches at peace. The resolutions were passed. I said they would cause divisions. In 1869 we have the divisions. But the Association claims that my teachings have made the divisions. Suppose we grant it, then what? Ought the teachings to have caused divisions? Let the reader answer after a careful perusal of these pages. But was it not the dominant party in the Association that caused the divisions? But, if my doctrines were “inconsistent with Bible teaching,” the churches ought to have known it. But there was a large majority in the church to which I belonged, that did not think my teachings were unscriptural. I submitted to the decision of the church, could I have done more or less than this, and have been consistent with the doctrines of the Baptist Church? But notice—“We will not receive messengers from any church which calls or retains such a minister as pastor.” Why not? Have not Baptist Churches

the sole government of the kingdom in their hands? Has not the judgment been committed to the church, and can it be taken out? Am I not a member of a Baptist Church in full fellowship? Can you decide the cause of applicants for membership in a church? If not, then, if I can be a member of a church, can I not be a pastor? But why should the Association attempt to manufacture public opinion? Are not Baptist Churches capable of deciding who among Baptist Preachers will suit them as pastors? Why did not the Association advise the church to withdraw her fellowship from me, and then, if the church refused, just say we have no further jurisdiction?

O! why did it not uphold the glorious old banner of soul liberty and church independence? Why interfere with the internal regulations of churches? The right for the Association to say who shall not be pastors of churches among Baptist preachers implies the right to say who shall be. But Associations are composed largely of preachers. Why then should the question of pastorates be raised just here? What did these preachers mean? Were they in need of the churches to which I was preaching? But does not this Association complain of me for making divisions, and at the same time advise divisions? Here is consistency with a "vim."

If the majority of a church will, call or retain

such a minister, "we advise the minority to arise at a regular meeting and create a cism, divide the church, and then claim to be *the* Church."

Alas, for the frailty of man, when left to himself! God never promised his spirit to Associations to guide them into all truth. That moment they leave their legitimate business all is chaotic darkness. Then plainly, if I had been ~~the~~ the heretic described by the Association, I ought to have been excluded, and all those who were with me. Why did not the Association say so at once? She ought not to have complained of me for causing the divisions she, herself, had made. But we let the matter rest here. We desire to call attention to this evil to warn other bodies from a similar fall. God was not in the work, and she could not control. I preached in her churches while she was thundering her enathemas upon me. I went everywhere preaching the *word*. My church said go, I could not do otherwise. "Her voice was to me as the voice of God." I rejoice that church sovereignty triumphed at last.

CHAPTER IV. FOURTH YEAR IN KENTUCKY.

I entered the school room again in August, 1870, and continued for one year. In September the Association met again at Mt. Zion, Hardin county. I did not go but the church at Hodgenville, of

which I was a member, did send up delegates. A minority party split off a few days before the Association met, and sent up delegates also. I was not pastor of the church, having resigned at the first meeting after the previous meeting of the Association. But all this did no good, the minority party was received, and the majority rejected. I preached on and taught school and paid no further attention to the Association. In May, 1871, the majority party of Hodgenville church sent out a pamphlet setting forth her grievance, and asking for aid. Her arguments were unanswerable, and they triumphed. Brethren Dr. J. S. Coleman and Dr. A. C. Caperton visited the Salem Association, having previously visited Hodgenville church, and making with her the following arrangements :

The majority and minority parties agreed that a committee, composed of the following able brethren should try the case and look into the cause of separation, and after having the case fully explained, the committee was to make a decision which was to be final. The committee to consist of Drs. J. S. Coleman, A. C. Caperton, J. H. Spencer, W. W. Gardner, and Elder V. E. Kirtley.

On the consumation of this agreement the church united, and as a united church sent up delegates to the meeting of the Association at Big Spring church, Hardin county, Ky. The delegates were all received and so the matter ended. The committee of Breth-

ren above named were to have met with the Hodgenville church on Tuesday, November 11, 1871. I was present on the day appointed, but none of the Committee came. We waited another day, and none came; so the church remains united as per agreement. And as I had moved the first of September to Campbellsville, my present home, I asked for a letter of dismissal at the first regular meeting of the church, which was Saturday before the third Sunday in November. This was granted. I then united with the Campbellsville church and at her regular meeting in December 1871, was unanimously called as pastor to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the lamented Willis Peck, who had been for years the Moderator of Russels Creek Association. Thus ended the four years war in which there was much evil done to our cause. But we thank God and take courage, there now seems to be a disposition upon the part of our brethren to look more favorably upon our teachings. Much, however, remains to be done to build up the waste places in our Zion. O, that God may give more of his love and spirit, till we shall all quit ourselves like men, and do valiantly for the truth. And may the hour speedily come when we can say:

“Hail, sweetest, dearest tie, that binds
Our Glowing hearts in one.

Hail, sacred hope, that tunes our minds
To Harmony divine.”

It is the hope, the blissful hope,
“Which Jesus grace has given—

The hope when days and years are past,
We *all* shall meet in heaven.”

May we learn in days and years to come, how blessed it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. And now to all, who are the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ, whether connected with this difficulty or not, there shall be no difference with me. Here's my Heart and here's my Hand, to live with you for Christ's sake, and if need be, to die with you. I ask that the mantle of charity be thrown over the follies of the past, whether mine or yours. If you can forget mine, I can and WILL forget yours. And now, and forever, we will be one. Let the past be past; but let the future tell in good works, in deeds of kindness. For we will find opposition enough from without. Let us then be at peace, one with another, and seek for the things of others not our own. For we are bought with a price, even the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; hence we are not our own, but His, who bought us. Then let us feel "For me to live is Christ."

APPENDIX.

MY POSITION—A CHANGE. WRITTEN MAY, 1871.

My position for five or six years past has been that "The promises are to the church, to christians, the baptized." Hence to the *unbaptized there is no promise*. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." I do not say the unbaptized, i. e. those who refuse to be baptized will be damned, but I do say they are excluded from the promise in the commission. This position is sustained by the following arguments :

1. It is the requirement of the great Lawgiver in Zion, that all who are made disciples shall be baptized. "Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." Any person, then, who refuses to be baptized, sets aside the authority of Christ. To such an one, Jesus makes no promise.

2. All New Testament Christians were, for some reason, baptized, and that too, immediately after they believed. Thus they acted in accordance with the Divine commission and fulfilled its requirements. In every place where baptism is referred to in the epistles to the churches, it is taken for granted that all have been baptized. And Peter, who writes for those scattered abroad, says, "A like figure, whereunto even baptism doth now save us." Plainly implying that he, with all christians, had been baptized. But the promises are to christians, i. e. disciples, and as *all* these have been baptized, the promises are to the baptized. There is nothing said as to those who may yet be, who will not be baptized, hence I can not say the promises are to these, for I do not know that they are.

3. None have ever been regarded as church members till baptized. But the promise is to the church, as the bride of Christ.

It is the church for which Christ gave himself. It is the church that is to be saved and presented to the Father, without spot or wrinkle. Hence the promises are to the baptized church of Jesus Christ.

4. This view is confirmed by the testimony of all able commentators and critics of every denomination of professed christians on earth, except the Quakers, or Friends. In all ages, from the days of the apostles, none have been regarded as christians who have refused to be baptized. Not that baptism made men christians, but a refusal to accept of it has been regarded as sufficient grounds for denying to such the title of christian or follower of Christ. "If you will go to the 'font,' then will we believe."

My position has been that Protestants are not christians, (it should never be forgotten that Baptists are not Protestants) from the fact that they all came out of Rome, "spiritually called Babylon." And as a stream can not rise higher than its head, and as like always begets like, I said Rome can only bring forth Rome. If Protestants are not the children of Rome, I do not know where to place them. They are like the mother in many respects. They oppose the church of Christ, and wherever they have had power have persecuted the church with sword and imprisonment. They baptize (if such a farce can be called baptism) their infant children, and thus induct them into the church, unregenerate. Let this one principle alone prevail, and they would swallow the world in fifty years, and every mark and vestige of a true church would be blotted out. They urge the unregenerate to come forward and join the church, that they may be saved by being in the bosom of the church; and but for the leaven the Baptists keep in the world by contending for a couverted church, in a few short years the world and the church would be one. Happily for the cause of truth, the people have more sense of propriety than their spiritual advisers. Intelligent

men and women, in their wickedness, know that they are not fit to be members of Christ's church. They have taken, like their mother, pouring and sprinkling as baptism. With them, a drop is as good as the ocean, when water is to be applied. But when they ask to be "re-baptized" in the Holy Ghost, I guess they would like to have a little more than a drop. But all lexicographers, annotators, commentators, and scholars, are agreed that the word in the Greek *baptidzo*, in the English Bible *baptise*, means to immerse, to plunge, to dip; and that it does not mean to pour or sprinkle. Yet these pretended pious people will say sprinkling and pouring for baptism is just as good as immersion. I said, surely the lovers of our Lord Jesus Christ will not thus treat his command. I said, surely these are not christians. They are not like Christ.

5. But they build up great religious hierarchies, and call them the churches of Jesus Christ. For these the priests make laws, and change them at pleasure. Of course their subjects never join the church of Christ, since they claim that theirs are the true churches of God. Thus with their human inventions they try to overshadow and destroy the church of God. I said surely these can not be the meek and lowly followers of Jesus. Jesus says, "No man can be my disciple except he deny himself, take up his cross and follow me." "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." "He that heareth these sayings of mine and *doeth* them, shall be as a man that builds his house upon a rock." "Not every one that saith unto me Lord! Lord! shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that *doeth* the will of my Father which is in heaven." Paul says, "Jesus became the author of eternal salvation to all those that obey him." John says, "This is the love of God, that ye keep his commandments." So I said Protestants are not christians. They have infant membership, unregenerate members, sprinkling and pouring for baptism, hierarchies for churches, persecuting the church of Christ. These are not the disciples of Christ.

They do not *deny themselves*. They do not do what HE commands. They hear his sayings but do not obey them. Their fruits are the fruits of darkness, so I said they are not the disciples of HIM who said, "He that keepeth my commandments, he it is that loveth me." But in a day of darkness I gave up all for lost. No, not *all*, I did not give up Jesus. I did not give up the ministry of the Spirit. I did not give up christian love. I bless God for this much. But the church, and the Baptist cause, I gave them up. I saw so much evil in my own baptized brethren that I said, surely Pedo-Baptists are as good as these. I said I would wait till this darkness be over passed. I said we will yet have more light. Thus three years have passed. I could not pray as I had been accustomed to in former days. The Bible was almost a sealed book to me. I could not read it much, why should I? Had I not read it for ten years, almost constantly? Now my brethren told me I could not understand it. Why should I read? I could not, although I tried, but I enjoyed much of the ministration of the Spirit.

I tried to believe that all were christians who professed to love our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I have tried to treat them as christians, but I have never ceased to look back with sorrow for those blessed days of inward peace, when I was contending for the punctilious obedience to the commands of Christ. While on a bed of affliction, this spring, March, 1873, all the past came before me in panoramic vision. I lived over those stormy, *peaceful* days. I said I will write it in a book. It must not be lost. I said I will tell it to my brethren, and see what they will say; perhaps they will hear me now.

This, my brethren, is the origin of this little volume. And oh, how earnestly have I prayed that God may give you grace to hear. My soul has caught the old flame while writing; the vision's spell is broken, and I now come back to the word of God. My tongue has been loosed, and I feel like a new man. I tremble again at

the word of God. The Bible again is the plain book. Thank God for his mercy !

But one is ready to say, "If you preach perfection you will cut off yourself and your own brethren—none are perfect." Suppose we are not, must we not preach "*the Word*." But my brethren are we not commanded to be holy as God is holy. Now you say, "but we can not be holy." "Sin is mixed with all we do." I answer *we can try*. And he who has faith in his efforts and tries is much more likely to succeed than he who takes it for granted he can not succeed. I now look upon the Baptists as the only true Israel of God, and that it is theirs to evangelize the world. But how can they do this while they make the admission that others are as good as they. Our denomination is as a sleeping giant, or like Sampson in the lap of Delilah. We admit that we can not, i. e. Christians can not, understand the word of God ; we admit that our imperfections are such that we can not claim to be the only people of God ; we admit that it is impossible to keep all the commands of Christ ; and hence admit that Protestants are Christians. Alas ! alas ! for our future until we shall awake. O Zion, awake ! awake ! put on thy beautiful garments. Let us come forth in the strength of God to do valiantly. Let us lift up our standard and inscribe upon it "*Holiness to the Lord*." Let there be a difference between us and the mere professor of Christianity. As ministers let us be wholly consecrated to the preaching of the Gospel. As brethren let us give till we feel it, give till the millions of unconsecrated wealth in our possession shall be consecrated to the preaching of the Gospel. As sisters let it be said of you, "She hath done what she could." And as a people let us manifest our charity till all the world shall say, "Behold how these brethren love one another."

We are not doing one tenth of what we ought to do for the evangelizing of the world. Let us hear the call then, and

awake from our slumbers. This, my brethren, we can not do while we admit that those who do not obey Christ are just as good as those who do. This we never can do while we are content to say we can not obey Christ in all things. We can not be the light of the world till we put on the beautiful garments of salvation.

STRAY LEAVES.

Salem Association, at her regular meeting held with the Bewleyville Church in 1868, said; "In our opinion the doctrine of *No discipleship without baptism*, as propagated by Rev. G. A. Coulson, is, in our judgment, both unscriptural and disorganizing." In 1870, W. H. Faucher delivered an oration before the Sunday School Convention of Louisiana, which was published in *The Baptist*, August 13, by request of the Convention, in which the following occurs: "Now if Christ, the great and only law-giver in Israel, the head of the Church, made immersion as well as faith **ESSENTIAL TO DISCIPLESHIP**, to church fellowship, *you* must give it that prominency in all your Sabbath School institutions. If Christ united belief and immersion in what he bade his disciples teach and do, *you* dare not separate them. Remember they were joined together by God the Son, and what God hath joined together let no man put assunder."

I would simply ask, what are we to do when the Conventions differ? Which is right, the Convention or the Association?

No one is asked to adopt my views. If I could have placed the matter before my brethren years ago, I think the difficulty would have ended much sooner. While it is true that I maintained that Pedo-Baptists are not christians, it is equally true that I never demanded of my brethren that they should adopt these views. I did not fall out with those who maintained that there are christians as pious and devoted as we are, in the Pedo-Baptist ranks. I found no fault with my brethren for be-

believing that Protestants are disciples. My brethren found fault of me for saying that these are not christians. My brethren caused the divisions themselves, and then charged them to me. I never wanted any divisions, but I did most heartily desire to live in peace with my brethren.

In sending forth this book, I wish it definitely understood that I do not wish any one to endorse my views. If they are scriptural I should be glad for them to prevail universally; if they are not I want them to perish. But I ask to be permitted to remain in peace among my brethren, and not to be regarded as a heretic. This is all I ask. "Let us not fall out about our opinions concerning the characters of others. Brethren, let us have no divisions among us.

AN INCIDENT.

A good brother, who has since gone to his rest, once asked me to read the 17th and 18th verses of the 16th chapter of Romans. He was one of those who thought I taught heresy, and caused divisions. He intended for me to apply it to myself. I arose to read and he said he would excuse me, fearing he would insult me. I said no, I will read. I read slowly and deliberately. Brethren were all attention.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have heard, and avoid them." I paused to ask a few questions. Have not Protestants caused divisions and offences in the church among christians? If you claim them as christians do not *they* cause offences and divisions? Is not their separation from us on account of the doctrines they teach contrary to that which you have learned? Are you not commanded to avoid them?—"For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ. I stopped. All was breathless silence. I re-read—"Serve not our Lord Jesus Christ." If Baptists, who go astray from the

teachings we have learned are not the disciples of Christ, I ask are Pedo-Baptists? I said, my brother, you have asked me to read the very Scripture to prove my position. I admit, sir, if I teach contrary to Scripture, and cause divisions, I am not in the service of our Lord Jesus Christ.

These questions were terrible upon my opponents. "For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the people." This, I said, is just what I have been saying of Protestants. They are teaching contrary to Scripture, and yet they have a great many good words and fair speeches. They deceive the hearts of the simple. We ought to avoid them; we ought not to bid them God speed. I was not called on again to read in that community.

ANOTHER INCIDENT.

The day that Bro J. Tol. Miller drew out of Gilead church, and thereby caused the division, there was a minister of some influence and considerable experience invited to preach for us. He was a preacher of some twenty or thirty years, and about fifty years of age. Pending my trial for "heresy" he said: "My brethren, the Scriptures are very plain upon what you must do with a heretic; you are not to reason with him—you are not to debate with him—you are not to discuss the question with him, but you are to withdraw your fellowship from him."

I have often told the brethren that he reminded me of a lawyer, of whom it is said, on one occasion he was prosecuting a case of supposed murder. The evidence not being very clear as to the guilt of the man, he arose and made a most eloquent speech upon the evils of murder and what ought to be done with murderers. He held up the murderer in the most odious light, but when he was through the attorney for the defence

arose and said : " Your Honor, and these gentlemen of the jury, will do me the kindness to remember that the question before the Court is not what ought to be done with a mnrderer, but, *is my client guilty of murder ?* nhii, however, does not appear very clear." So I said afterwards of this preacher, the question is not what ought to be done with heretics, BUT AM I A HERETIC ? An opinion as to the christianity of any man or set of men outside of the church cannot be heresy, and should not be punished as such.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Jesus said, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." This Scripture is applicable to Christians now as the promise of the Holy Spirit as a Comforter. Then we have the promise of the divine guidance so that we may not go astray in what Christ has taught us, The Holy Spirit takes the words of Jesus and applies them to us. We being enlightened by Him are able to understand the words of our blessed Saviour. So then when we are born of God we are also taught of him, so that we need not go wrong. Hence the way is made plain and the path of duty plain; for this reason all those who will not follow the teachings of the New Testament are to be regarded as the enemies of Christ. But suppose we take the position that the Spirit was given to the disciples to guide them into all truth for the purpose of writing the New Testament. I would ask, what advantage could this be if coming generations of Christians were to be left in the dark as to what these teachings are? If God designed that his people should *know* what he taught, he of course gave them such a revelation as they could understand. But that this was the design is evident from the fact that he gave the Holy Spirit to bring to the minds of the disciples all things that Jesus had taught them. For this purpose the Spirit is given to guide into all truth that we might have the truth.

But it has often been said to me, "You must not think that babes in Christ know all their duty." I have as often replied, I do not think they do; but this is not applicable to pedo-baptists, for the old ones are as far from the truth as the young ones; and the great trouble is that they are not willing to learn their duty. But if we do not know what baptism is, we may not know what any of the teachings of Christ are, and hence we are upon a sea of doubt.

THE SHEEP.

"His honor is engaged to save
The meanest of his sheep,
And all those his Father gave
His hands securely keep."

Jesus said of his sheep, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." How we delight in this glorious truth! If I am Christ's then eternal life is mine, heaven is mine. He has said it—I shall *never* perish. But he said, "My sheep hear my voice and they follow me, and a stranger's voice will they not follow." They follow me. Is it true then that we shall never perish? Then is it also true that we follow Christ? But have not Protestants followed Rome? Is not the tendency with them to Rome all the time? But it is said many pedo-baptists are deceived by their leaders. So it may be; but if so, this simply shows that they are not of Christ's sheep, because they hear the voice of strangers. Satan and his messengers and servants may transform themselves into angels of light. But they can not deceive the elect. Should the sheep go astray they soon return again. He brings them back to the fold. But this is not the case with pedo-baptists. Protestants go astray from the womb. They begin wrong and end wrong. They came out of Rome and are tending back again. So then they are not following Christ, and therefore are not the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ.

INCIDENTS.

The night before Bro. Robt. Thurman preached his sermon at Nolin Church (an answer to which appears in this book) I was preaching at White Mills, in Hardin County. Two persons joined the Church after preaching. I asked them when they wished to be baptized. They said any time that would suit me. It was a beautiful moonlight night, the weather warm, and the water just by the church. I said, how would you like to be baptized just now? They answered, we are ready, and I announced to the audience we will proceed to the water at once to attend to the ordinance of baptism. We went down, and in the presence of a large audience I buried them with Christ in baptism. The report was before me the next day when I got to Nolin Church, and some were accusing me of being a Campbellite, because I had baptized in the night. I simply said to them, "You had better not press the question too far, or you will make Paul a Campbellite." I heard nothing more about baptizing in the night.

THE THIEF ON THE CROSS.

It can not be shown that the thief was not baptized. The committal of crime and the punishment for it may be many years apart. He may have done the stealing years before he was arrested and brought to trial. He may have repented and been a believer in Christ, and have been baptized by John or by Christ's disciples. His language is not that of a penitent or sinner asking for mercy; but it is that of a true believer. But suppose he was not baptized, then what? Here, you say, is a man saved without baptism. Grant it, and it militates not against my position. Protestants are not on the Cross. There is no physical inability preventing them from being baptized. So the cases are not analogous. I have been often asked, How about a man on a sick-bed so that he can not be baptized? and

how about the thief on the Cross? Such questions simply show that these persons have not understood my position. Protestants are not on the Cross, nor are they on a sick-bed; if so, then the case is analogous, not till then. These all have the opportunity to be baptized, but they will not.

An eminent doctor of divinity once wrote me, "If your position be that pedo-baptists are not Christians, then the thousands of them who die triumphantly proves your position false." I answered, "I do not think so; for the Psalmist says, The wicked have no bands in their death; and the Bible is as silent as the grave upon the proof of our christianity by the death we die." It is said, The righteous has hope in his death. But it is not said the sinner has not. A man's life is the sublime test of his christianity.

A STORY.

When I was a boy I used to hear the Methodists tell the following story. Once there was a man built him a flouring-mill, and it was in such a position that the people came by many roads from all points of the compass to bring their wheat; and it is said the miller never asked the people what road they came; but his only question was, "Is your wheat good?" An affirmative answer to this question was all that was necessary. The wheat was received. This was applied to christianity. All the different religious denominations will get to heaven at last provided their religion is good, it makes no difference what road they go. But this is the very question at issue—is the wheat good? is your heart right? much as the ignorant have been deceived by this specious fallacy. You have only to mention the fact that there is in the New Testament but one way, and it is strait and narrow, and the analogy fails. It is all fallacious. Let us examine ourselves then to see whether we are in the faith.

BAPTISM ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION.

How often have we heard it said, "Baptism is not essential to salvation. We can get to heaven as well without it as with it." Now why all this noise about the essentiality of baptism? Is it not the command of the Master? and is not this all we need to know to make it binding on us. While baptism is not essential to salvation, a willingness to be baptized may be. You may rightly fear that you will not be saved if you do not desire to obey any and all of Christ's commands, whether essentials or non-essentials. If Peter had continued to refuse Christ and not had his feet washed, he would have had no part with him. He would in this have substituted his own will for the will of the Law-giver. "Ye are my friends if ye do *whatsoever* I command you."

A DREAM.

A Methodist minister once related the following dream to his audience in the Baptist house of worship in Aberdeen, Mississippi. "A good Methodist brother once dreamed that he died and went to heaven, and at the gate of the beautiful city he met the angel Gabriel. Anxious to know the condition of his own brethren, he asked the angel if there were any Methodists there. Gabriel answered, *No*. He was amazed, confounded, and overwhelmed. But thinking next of those most like himself he ventured to ask if there were any Presbyterians. The angel answered, *No*. He knit his brow for very wonder, and then asked if there were any Episcopalians. Again he hears the same monotonous answer, *No*. Supposing then that we had all missed the prize, and that after all his grandmother was right, he says, Are there any Catholics here? *No*, says the angel, *no*. Here all hope seemed to give way. But remembering a poor despised sect called Baptists, he asked,

Then are there any Baptists here? But still the same answer comes, No. Overwhelmed, he cries out in the agony of his soul, Who then are here? The answer comes with thrilling joy to his desponding heart, Christians, sir, only Christians." So it is, said the preacher. Neither Methodist nor Baptist nor Presbyterians nor Catholics will be found in heaven. Only Christians will be there. Presbyterians and Methodists were ready to shout for joy, That is it! that is it! Christians in heaven. We are all Christians, so we will all get to heaven!

I ventured to offer a few comments upon this dream. First, It is only a dream, and therefore is but as the chaff to the Word of God. God spake by the mouth of his prophet saying, "If any man hath a dream, let him tell a dream; but he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully, for what is the chaff to the wheat, saith my God."

A dream may be a delusion, but the Word of God can not fail us. Some persons were more taken with this dream than they would have been with the plain teachings of the Word of God.

But now I ask in all candor, if none but Christians will be found in heaven, why keep up these distinctions here on earth? It would be infinitely better for the world for us all to be Christians here and put an end to all these divisions.

Lastly, granting it to be true that only Christians will be found there, might it not be that many will find in that great day that they have deceived themselves, and are after all not Christians?

Said the Divine Teacher, "*Many* will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Persons have often said to me, "If only the baptized are saved, how few will be the number?" But I have as often answered, Jesus says, "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life

and few there be that find it." I take no pleasure in contemplating the fact that millions and multiplied millions of our race will after all the efforts made to save them, at last go down to hell. Yet, I know it is so. I do take pleasure however in viewing by faith that innumerable company which no man can number that shall stand before the throne of God, of whom it shall be said, "These are they who have come through great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." I would labor therefore while in the world for the salvation of those whom God proposes to save. The blessed Gospel of the Son of God is worthy of all acceptance, and worthy of the acceptance of all, and I should be glad to have all accept it. The warnings given in the Word of God are for our admonition. Let us then not be deceived nor deceive ourselves. "He that doeth righteousness is righteous; he that committed sin is of the devil."

A WORD OF KINDNESS.

Kind words have a power over the heart and mind that is irresistible. They cost us nothing, they are of incalculable benefit to others. I have ever felt that my words were not what they ought to be. I have much of the milk of human-kindness in my heart, but how to manifest it to others as I ought, I find great difficulty in knowing. My mind is often disturbed because I have spoken unkindly to others. I have now written this book in the fear of God and for the good of others, but I fear that many of my Pedit-baptist friends will think I am not kindly disposed toward them. I fear some of my brethren will feel that I do not have as much love for them as I ought. I know that I indulge not the slightest hatred toward any, and if they would only remember that it is necessary for me to say some things about them in order to vindicate myself, they would excuse me. I would now

expunge every word of a personal nature from this work if I thought it would make peace, and not destroy my usefulness as a minister. I have had a hard struggle to keep down my feelings of resentment in the difficulty. And while writing I find the same trouble. I could wish that all may take this view of the matter. I, as a minister, have been charged with disturbing the peace of our Zion. I cannot be useful till this charge is removed or its force broken. I have no way of removing it but by letting the facts be known. I know I am not to blame for the divisions that occurred in Salem Association, but I am willing to confess that I said and did many things that were wrong. I had, however, no disposition to be separated from my brethren. I stretched out my hand to them day after day. I called them by the endearing name of brother, till it was no longer pleasing to them. I desired to live in peace with them, though we might be the poles apart in our views of theology. I know they will not, they cannot charge me with treating them unkindly because we did not agree in religious matters. I hope, therefore, they will call to mind these things and remember how fondly I hoped to be reconciled to them. I wish to say to all, that I now ask to be forgiven for any and all offences that I may have committed against any. I am ready to forgive all.

There is not a man in the world that I will refuse to forgive all trespasses if he does but ask it. And I will not only forgive but I will forget. I will bury the past forever. I only ask that my character as a christian and a gentleman be vindicated. I have no charges to bring against any only so far as their words or actions effect me. I must say that I think you are wrong when you say I am dishonest, but I will not fall out with you about this even. I want us all as baptists, to rise above all personal considerations, and all petty

strife, and show to the world that ours is a christianity that is higher than earth. That it has an origin divine. I want us to remember the high and holy calling we have received of God; that we should be the salt of the earth—the light of the world. Let it be seen by others who are around us, that we are not actuated by selfish motives in any thing, but that we are crucified to the world, and that the world is crucified to us. O! how anxious I am that we may all come out from the world, and show that we have a christianity that is heaven-born. I would have the mouths of gainsayers stopped. I would have us to so manifest our christianity to others that we may be living epistles, known and read of all men. I would have us so speak and act that men shall be forced to say we have been with Jesus. Let us vindicate the honor of our religion. Let us show that it is better than all other religions. Brethren, behold the starry crown He holds out to us. “Be faithful unto death,” He says, “and you shall wear this crown.” I do believe that if we would all pray and strive for higher attainments in the divine life, we would be abundantly blessed; and that in a few years we would stand upon an eminence far above our present position. God *will* bless those who do his will. O, my brethren, can we not lay aside every weight and the sin that so easily besets us, and run with more patience the race that is set before us? I know we could if we would ever be looking to Jesus the Author and Finisher of our faith. Could we but keep our eyes on Him who bore our grief and took away our sorrows, we would think less of earth and more of heaven. But we need all to pray the prayer of faith; and to this end to pray: “Lord increase our faith.” Faith rests upon testimony, we must have, therefore, the testimony of God in our minds and in our hearts, so that we may have the high and sublime living-faith that overcomes

the world and pries into the eternal glories beyond the skies. We should forget then the things that are behind, and press forward to those that are before. We ought to look more to Christ and less to ourselves. I think we all have lost much in mixing with the world. We are commanded to come out from the world, this is the object of our baptism; to separate us from the world. We should then cut loose from it, and let the people know that we are not of the world. Brethren, what say you; are you willing to try? While I write I pray that you all may, and that I also may have grace to go up with you. Will you go with me to the foot of the cross awhile? Let us go by faith and gather around Him who hangs bleeding, groaning, dying there. O, my brethren, let us get very near this scene of suffering. Hear, will you, those groans, see those death struggles! See, will you, the awful sufferings depicted in that Lamb-like countenance! O! see those expressive eyes as they are swimming in tears! O! what a burst of agony as He cries out: "*Eloi, Eloi, Lamasa bathani*:" my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!

We almost start back with affright from such scenes of woe. But the last look is given—he casts his dying eyes towards his enemies and says, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do." He means forgive them for crucifying him. Let them be as other men now. Open thou their eyes and let them see that I am not that malefactor they took me to be.

Did e're such love and sorrow meet? But he calmly says, all is finished, and gives up the Spirit. His life is gone. There is the body, but the spirit has fled. Will it return? It is for us he has died. O, what a price he has paid, but the death struggle is over, all is dark and lifeless now. And the inanimate partakes of the astonishment. The sun in sadness veils his face, and darkness covers the earth.

Let us follow him to the grave—see how still he lies; that is the sleep of death. How sweet to rest from labor; but oh! how cold and cheerless the grave, how dark and gloomy the house of the dead! But the stone is placed over the door and it is now sealed. We will go away and return again. The third day he said he would rise again; my brethren, let us go back to the grave on the appointed morning. But angels are in advance of us. Lo! the women are already there. See, will you, the stone has been rolled away, the grave is empty—Jesus is risen from the dead! O! slow of heart to believe; while he was with us did he not tell us he would rise again? Did he not manifest to us in a thousand ways that he is the Son of God? Why should we doubt so soon? But we find him with us in the way to Emmeus, how glorious the manifestation—our hearts burn within us. Again and again he appears to us, and talks of the things that pertain to the kingdom, until the time comes for him to leave us. But he says, I will not leave you comfortless, I will send you another comforter whom the world cannot receive. He shall bring to your minds the words that I have spoken. He shall guide you into all truth. He shall remain with you forever. Blessed Jesus, thou hast not left us to groop our way in the dark, thou hast not left us to ourselves to determine thy precepts. We have a guide that is Divine—we have a comforter that will never leave us. Blessed Jesus, thou hast been very mindful of us. But will you hear his voice as he speaks for the last time in person to you: “Go disciple the nations baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.” Go and tell the good news to all the world, tell it to every creature, “The one believing and being baptized shall be saved.” “The one refusing to believe shall be damned.” What a commission! How responsible our positions! And yet how glorious our work.

Brethren, what say you? Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles of old have gone before. A mighty host of martyrs have led the way, but there is much remains to be done. These have sown that we might reap; shall we gird ourselves for the toil? Shall we put on the whole armor of God and go forth to conquer the world. Can we not, shall we not go up and possess the land? I for one am ready; I say we are well able to overcome it. Let us once be united and turn off all idlers and stragglers, that will not enlist for the war; let us consecrate all that we have and are, to the service of the Master, and we will come off more than conquerors. Let each and every one lay to a helping hand, and the work is done. Let us inscribe upon our banners, **THE TRUTH IN LOVE.** "*One Lord, One Faith, and One Baptism.*" Cutting ourselves loose from the world and all the so-called churches and christians, and putting our trust in God, we may take the world in a few years. It is not impossible that a nation might be born in a day. God has promised, and the God of Israel is not a man that he should lie. He has bid us go up and possess the land. How glorious it will be, by and by, when laboring and toil is done, to lay our armour by and rest from the blest employment. And then when our Savior shall come we will be able to say, "here am I and the children thou hast given me." And he will say, "Well done thou good and faithful servant enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Then will we reply, "Honor and dominion, and power, and glory to him forever and ever, who has washed us and redeemed by his own precious blood." "Not unto us not unto us, but unto thy name be all the glory both now, and forever, Amen."

MY PRESENT POSITION.

My present position is that my former position is the only tenable ground for Baptists to successfully occupy. We maintain that baptism is essential to church membership. We prove this by the admission of all Pedobaptists. No church without baptism is the universal decision. Also by the teachings of the New Testament, baptism always preceded church membership, and all church members were baptized in that day. We commune only with the baptized church member. No place is found between faith and baptism for any other duty, so far as the cases recorded in the New Testament go. But in the body of this book I have shown that the same is true of discipleship—Pedobaptists and Catholics—all unite in saying that those who reject baptism are not Christians. Baptism always following faith immediately, there is no such thing as recognized Christians living and dying without baptism—no place between this and faith for any other Christian duty. So the arguments to my mind are the same; and this is what I meant by asking Bro. Layman years ago to prove that baptism is essential to church membership. I knew if he would do so, I would show by the same process of reasoning that my position is true. Let any one test the arguments of both, and so far as Scripture is concerned he will find them the same. The New Testament knows no more of *unbaptized* Christians than it does of unbaptized church members. There is just as much Scripture for the one as the other, and there is none for either. I do fondly hope that there are thousands of Protestants who have been converted, and that they will be led by the Holy Spirit to come out of Rome. Thousands have come out, and we trust thousands more may; but while they remain in Rome, I can not recognize them as the followers of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I do not know them to be Christians. But of one thing I am satisfied. All persons, of all denominations whatever, who love our Lord Jesus Christ and who put their trust in him, will find salvation in the day of the Lord. But I am satisfied all these desire to know and do his will. Religion has its foundation in the heart. It is of God. It is love from God to us, and this love reflected back to him. Neither faith nor zeal, neither repentance nor baptism, will accomplish any thing without love. All the law is fulfilled in this: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "The end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart." To love God with all the heart and our neighbor as ourself is to fulfill the royal law. Upon these hang all the law and the prophets. But love rejoiceth in the truth. Love leads us to warn others of the danger of sin. Love leads us to keep or strive to keep all the commands of God our Saviour. I do not love Protestants and Catholics less because I fear they are not Christians. I would not, I *could* not, have been influenced by any other motive than love for them and the cause of Christ to set forth these teachings. If they *are* Christians they will not, they can not, differ from me as to the importance of obeying all the commands of Christ. They can not love me the less because I am mistaken. We differ upon many points, and yet I am not angry with them. I do not see why they should be with me. I think it shows a bad state of heart for a man to get mad because any one calls his Christianity in question, for the best of us are often made to doubt ourselves. And how many often say, "I fear I am not a Christian." If you doubt your own Christianity, why not me doubt it? I have no fault to find with any one who may doubt mine. I can only pray to God to give me more of his spirit till I can live so there shall be no longer any doubt. If it shall appear in the great day of assizes that I have been mistaken, I will rejoice as much as any man. I mean I will rejoice to find that

Pedobaptists and Catholics are saved. I know some one will be mistaken. Many that think they will get to heaven will never set their feet upon the shining streets. Let each of us say from the depths of our souls, "Lord, is it I?" O what a catastrophe for a soul to be lost! O how fearful the thought that *my* soul may be lost! May God in mercy prevent such a calamity.

It were worth a lifetime of toil and labor to be saved in heaven, to have a home in the paradise of God. I pray you, kind reader, think of that soul of thine. Go bow before the cross of Christ, saying:

"Nothing in my hands I bring,
Simply to the cross I cling."

I now lay down my pen till something else shall cause me to take it up again. I have written this book in the fear of God and for the advancement of his cause. I have none but the kindest of feelings for all my friends and for all mankind. I will go forth now upon the "arena" again to do valiantly for the cause of truth. If God shall give me strength and means to support my family, I will continue to preach till life is over. I do not mind the work. It is sweet to labor for Christ and the souls of men. I wish all Christians could see alike, and could work together. But I am not discouraged; the hand that leads us is divine, and in the strength of Israel's God we will do valiantly. I am nothing—a poor sinner saved by grace. O how I love to tell to others what a dear Saviour I have found. I want them to find him too. I want all the world to be saved upon the terms of the gospel. I know I will suffer many things for writing this book. But I put my trust in God. While writing I closed my eyes to all consequences, and asked, "What is truth?" I hope I have found it.

XIII OF I COR.

Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up; doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things; charity never faileth. But whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there shall be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For we know in part and we prophesy in part, but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child, but when I became a man, I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face, now I know in part, but then shall I know even as I am known. And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity.

[THE END.]

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



44 898 406

BX

473535

6495

Coulson

.C87A2

Sit lux

MAY 15 '46

H. W. Perceat

STAYN

1- 3971

1- 3971



INFORMATION ON

BAPTIST WEEKLIES

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE WEEKLY
PEL



THE BAPTIST

44 898 406

THE INDEX AND SOUTHWESTERN
Ga. D. SHAVER, Editor.

THE TEXAS BAPTIST, Houston, Tex.

THE RELIGIOUS HERALD, Richmond,
DICKENSON, Editors.

THE CENTRAL BAPTIST, St. Louis,
Editor.

THE NATIONAL BAPTIST, Philadelphia,
LAND, Editor.

ZION'S ADVOCATE, Portland, Me.

WATCHMAN AND REFLECTOR, Boston,

CHRISTIAN ERA, Boston, Mass.

EXAMINER AND CHRONICAL, New York,

BAPTIST WEEKLY, New York, N. Y.

JOURNAL AND MESSENGER, Cincinnati,

STANDARD, Chicago, Ill.

MISSIONARY BAPTIST, Evansville, Ind.

IOWA BAPTIST, Okeola, Iowa.

THE EVANGEL, San Francisco, Cal.

Any of the above Weeklies can be
Every Baptist family should take one of
papers are a real necessity. No family
read a weekly religious newspaper. If
fall into the hands of any who are not
him send at once for one. All are good
paper should be preferred.

N OBSCURED

WEEKLIES

CHICAGO



06

sville, Ky. A. C. CA-

R. GRAVES, Editor.

WESTERN BAPTIST, Atlan-
itor.

iston, Texas. J. B. LINK, Editor.

D, Richmond, Va. JETTER &

St. Louis, Mo. J. H. LUTHER,

, Philadelphia, Pa. H. L. WAY-

nd, Me.

CTOR, Boston, Mass.

Mass.

CAL, New York, N. Y.

York, N. Y.

ER, Cincinnati, O.

ansville, Ind.

va.

sco, Cal.

s can be had at \$2,50 a year.
ake one or more of the... Such
No family should fail to keep
paper. Should this be book
are not taking such paper, let
all are good. Your own State

G. A. C.